
T H E

PREFACE.

WARS are most dreaded and hated by the Country where they are; but not so much by the Souldiers, who by them seek their Prey and Glory, as by the suffering Inhabitants that lose thereby their Prosperity and Peace, who yet are forced, or drawn to be siders, lest they suffer for Neutrality.

Religious (irreligious) Wars are of no less dismal Consequence, being about God himself, his Will, and Word, and that which more nearly toucheth our Souls and everlasting state, than our Houses and worldly Welfare does: And yet because Men are more sensible of their corporal than their spiritual Concerns, these Dogmatical Wars are far less feared, and too commonly made the Study, and Delight, not only of the Military Clergy, but also of the seduced and sequacious Laity: Though those that have the Wisdom from above, which is

The Preface.

pure and peaceable, condole the Church's Calamity hereby; knowing that Envy and Strife, the earthly sensual and devilish Wisdom, causeth Confusion, and every evil Work: And it is a heinous Aggravation, that the Militants, being Men consecrated to Love and Peace, profanely father their Mischiefs upon God, and do all as for Religion and Church.

Having these four and forty Tears at least, been deeply sensible of this Sin, Danger, and Misery of Christians, I have preach'd much, and written more against it: To confute those Extreams which cause Divisions, and to reconcile those that think they differ where they do not; sometime also using importunate Petitions and Pleas for Peace, to those that have power to give it, or promote it, and that use either Word or Sword against it. And with the Sons of Peace it hath not been in vain: But with those that are engaged in Faction and malicious strife, I am proclaimed to be the militant Enemy of Concord, for perswading them to Concord, and writing many Books for Peace and Love, is taken for writing them against these Controversies I have written of, but only to end them, and not to make them: And who can reconcile them that never mentioneth them? or arbitrate in a Cause unheard and not opened?

But,

The Preface.

But, Readers, I must tell you, that my title [An End of Doctrinal Controversies] is not intended as prognostick, but as dedatrical and directive. I am far from expecting an end of Controversies, while consecrated Ignorance is by worldly Interest, Faction, and Malice, mixed with Pride sublimated to an envious Zeal (Jam. 3. 15, 16.) and hath set up a Trade of slandering all those that are true Peace-makers, and concur not with them to destroy it, on pretence of defending it, by their impossible pernicious terms. He that will now be taken for a Peace-maker, must be content to be so called by a few, even by the Sett that he chuseth to please, and be contrarily judged of by all the rest. And this satisfieth some, because their Faction seemeth better than others, be they never so few; and others, because their Faction is great, or rich, or uppermost, how noxious and unpeaceable soever: For vespæ habent favos, saith Tertullian, & Marcionitæ Ecclesias: We could wish the Bees seldom used their stings, for it is their Death; but those of Wasps and Hornets, that make no Honey, are less sufferable.

It is partly for unprejudiced Students that I write, and partly for the times to come, when the Fruits of malignant Faction and Wars, have disgraced them, and made the world weary of them.

The Preface.

I am blamed by Dissenters, as coming too near by Conciliatory Explications, to some things which they call dangerous Points of Popery, Arminianism and Prelacy; but whether it be by Truth or by Error, I leave to trial: Sure our English Universities and Canonists. are not like to receive any hurt by it, who will not read a Book that they see my Name to, though the Doctrine would never so much gratifie them. And others (at home and Foreigners) are satisfied by Knowledge and Prepossession against such seeming Danger.

The great blemish of this, and other of my Writings is, That I say oft the same thing which I have said before. Much of this Book is in my Catholick Theology, and my Meth. Theol. and my Treatise of Justifying Righteousness. But, 1. Forgetfulness in Old Men that have written so much, is no wonder. 2. But it sheweth that I have not forgotten the Matter, nor take it up suddenly and superficially, which I so oft repeat. 3. And there may be great use for such Repetitions, when it is for clearer Method, or for epitomizing larger Writings, which many cannot, or will not read; but those that can, may have the benefit of more Explicatory Copiousness. If it profit the Reader, I am not solicitous for the Reputation of the Writer.

You will find here one Chapter answering Exceptions about Futurity; concerning which you must

The Preface.

must know, that my Catholick Theology was so bold and large an attempt to reconcile the Calvinist, and Lutheran or Arminian, and the Dominican and Jesuit, &c. that I lookt to have been sharply assaulted for it by many: But after many Years expectation I have heard of nothing written or spoken against it, save one MS. Paper of Objections about the Cause of Futurity, and Physical Predetermination to sin, by Mr. Polhill a Councillor, a Man of extraordinary Knowledge, and Godliness, (now enjoying the Fruit of it with Christ; O Blessed England, if its Rulers, Senators and Lawyers, yea, or Bishops and Teachers, were all such men) having many Years past sent him my Answer, (and having no Reply) as to the question, I refused to answer the second, having said so much to it in my Methodus Theol. and lest the quality of the Subject should make my Reply seem sharp to so good a man: And I thought it meet to publish this, because it is an unusual Dispute; and as no one else hath called me to it, so I know not where the Reader that differeth from me, will find so much for him; nor whither to refer him for an Answer. I publish not Mr. Polhill's Paper, because I recite so much of it as may tell the Reader what it was; and I must not swell the Book too much.

The Glorious Light will soon end all our Controversies, and reconcile those that by unfeigned

The Preface.

feigned Faith and Love are united in the Prince of Peace, our Head, by love dwelling in God, and God in them: But falsehearted, malignant, carnal Worldlings that live in the fire of wrath and strife, will find (so dying) the woful maturity of their Enmity to holy Unity, Love, and Peace; and the causeless shutting the true Servants of Christ out of their Churches, which should be the Porch of Heaven, is the way to be shut out themselves of the heavenly Jerusalem.

If those that have long reproached me as unfit to be in their Church (and said, ex uno disce omnes, with their Leader) find any unsound or unprofitable Doctrine here, I shall take it for a great favour to be confuted, even for the good of others excluded with me, when I am dead.

Jan. 21.
1691.

Richard Baxter.

THE

CONTENTS.

Chap. 1. **H**OW to conceive of G O D. Pag. i.
Chap. 2. **H**ow to conceive of the Trinity
in Unity. p. vii.
Chap. 3. How to conceive of the Hypostatical Union
and Incarnation. p. xxiii
Chap. 4. How to conceive of the Diversity of God's
Transient Operations. p. xxx.
Chap. 5. Whether any point of Faith be above or
contrary to Reason. p. xxxii.

Chap. I. Prefatory. *Who must be the Judge of Controversies. The true Causes of the Divisions of Christians about Religion.* p. 1.

Chap. 2. *The Doctrines enumerated about which they chiefly disagree.* p. 22.

Chap. III. *Of God's Will and Decrees in general. The Terms and several Cases opened.* p. 24.

Chap. IV. *Of God's Knowledge, and the Differences about it.* p. 41.

Chap. V. *Of Election; and the Order of Intention and Execution.* p. 36.

Chap. VI. *Of Reprobation, or the Decree of Damnation; the Objects and their Order.* p. 40.

An Answer to Mr. Polhill of Futurition. p. 46.

Chap. VII. *Of God's Providence and predetermining Premotion. Of Durandus's way.* p. 70.

Chap.

The CONTENTS.

- Chap. VIII. *Of the Cause of Sin: What God doth and doth not about it.* p. 82
- Chap. IX. *Of Natural Power and Free-will.* p. 89
- Chap. X. *Of Original Sin; as from Adam and nearer Parents.* p. 94
- Chap. XI. *Of our Redemption by Christ, what it doth; how necessary.* p. 89
- Chap. XII. *Of the several Laws and Covenants of God.* p. 99
- Sect. 1. *Of the Law or Covenant of Innocency made to Adam: Divers Cases.* p. 113
- Sect. 2. *Of the Law of Mediation or Covenant with Christ: When and what it was.* p. 121
- Sect. 3. *Of the Law or Covenant of Grace in the first edition: What it was.* p. 126
- Sect. 4. *Of the same Law with Abraham's Covenant of Peculiarity, and the Mosaical Jewish Law of Works.* p. 132
- Sect. 5. *Of the Law or Covenant of Grace in the last edition; the Gospel: Divers Cases about it opened.* p. 138
- Chap. XIII. *Of the universality and sufficiency of Grace. What Grace is: How far universal and sufficient.* p. 154
- Chap. XIV. *Of Man's Power and Free-will since the Fall. Adrian's Saying, That an unjustified man may love or chuse God's Being before his own. What to ascribe to Grace, and what to Free-will in good.* p. 173
- Chap. XV. *Of Effectual Grace; and how God giveth it. Doubts resolved.* p. 181
- Chap. XVI. *Of the State of Heathens, and such others as have not the Gospel: What Law the Heathen World*

The CONTENTS.

- World is under, and to be judged by : Whether any of them are justified or saved : The Heathens were the Corrupters of the old Religion, and the Jews of the Reformed Church, Mal. 1. 14, 15. and Sodom's Case, &c. considered.* p. 188
- Chap. XVII. *Of the necessity of Holiness and of Moral Virtue.* p. 203
- Chap. XVIII. *Of the necessity of Faith in Christ, where the Gospel is made known.* p. 212
- Chap. XIX. *Of the State of Infants as to Salvation and Church-membership.* p. 216
- Chap. XX. *Of the nature of Saving-Faith ; its Description and Causes.* p. 226
- Chap. XXI. *Of justifying Righteousness, Justification and Pardon. The several senses of the words, and several sorts of them : Our common Agreement about them.* p. 238
- Chap. XXII. *Of the Imputation of Righteousness. Christ's righteousness, in what sense ours and imputed ; and in what sense not.* p. 256
- Chap. XXIII. *How Faith justifieth, and how it is imputed for Righteousness. Several questions about it ; Repentance, &c. resolved.* p. 267
- Chap. XXIV. *Of Assurance of our Justification, and of Hope. What Assurance is desirable : What attainable : What Assurance we actually have : Who have it : The nature and grounds of it : Whether it be Divine Faith.* p. 279
- Chap. XXV. *Of Good works and Merit : And whether we may trust to any thing of our own. 1. What are Good Works : 2. Whether they are necessary to our Justification or Salvation : 3. Whether they are rewardable or meritorious : 4. What is their place,*
use

The CONTENTS.

use and necessity: 5. Whether to be trusted to.
p. 282

Chap. XXVI. Of Confirmation, Perseverance, and danger of falling away. 1. Whether all **Grace** given by Christ be such as is never lost. 2. Whether that degree be ever lost which (to Infants or Adult) giveth but the posse credere. 3. Whether any lose actual justifying Faith. 4. Or the Habit of Divine Love and Holiness. 5. Whether some degree of this may be lost. 6. If Holiness be not actually lost, is the loss possible? 7. Whether there be a state of Confirmation above the lowest Holiness, which secureth Perseverance. 8. Or doth Perseverance depend only on Election and God's Will. 9. Whether all, most or many Christians are themselves certain of their Perseverance. 10. Is such Certainty fit for all the justified? 11. Is it unfit for all, and doubting a more safe condition? 12. Doth the Comfort of most Christians rest upon the Doctrine of Certainty to persevere? 13. Doth the Doctrine of eventual Apostasie infer Mutability in God? 14. Why God hath left the point so dark. 15. What was the Judgment of the ancient Churches herein. 16. Is it of such weight as to be necessary to our Church-Communion, Love and Concord.

p. 300

Chap. XXVII. Of Repentance; late Repentance; the time of Grace, and the unpardonable sin. p. 314

BOOKS

BOOKS Printed for and Sold by *John*
Salisbury at the *Rising Sun* in *Cornhil*.

A *Rational Defence of Nonconformity, where-
in the Practice of Nonconformists is vin-
dicated from promoting Popery, and ruining the
Church, imputed to them by Dr. Stillingfleet
Bishop of Worcester, in his Unreasonableness
of Separation. Also his Arguments from the
Principles and Way of the Reformers and first
Dissenters are answered: And the case of the
present Separation truly stated; and the blame
of it laid where it ought to be; and the way to
Union among Protestants is pointed at. By
Gilbert Rule, D. D.*

*The Christian Laver: Being two Sermons on
John 13. 8. opening the nature of Participation
with, and demonstrating the necessity of Purifica-
tion by Christ. By T. Cruso.*

*Six Sermons on various occasions. By
T. Cruso, in 4^o.*

*The Conformists Sayings; or, the Opinion and
Arguments of Kings, Bishops, and several Di-
vines, assembled in Convocation.*

A new Survey of the Book of Common-Prayer.

The first of these is the fact that the
 Government has been unable to secure
 the necessary funds to carry out its
 policy of non-interference. This is
 due to the fact that the Government
 has been unable to secure the necessary
 funds to carry out its policy of non-
 interference. This is due to the fact
 that the Government has been unable
 to secure the necessary funds to carry
 out its policy of non-interference.

1000

1911



An END of •

Doctrinal Controversies, &c.

CHAP. I.

How we may and must conceive of GOD.

§. 1. **A** True Knowledge of God is necessary to the Being of Religion, and to Holiness and Glory. No man can love, obey, trust, or hope beyond his knowledge : Nothing is so certainly known as God, and yet nothing so defectively known : Like our Knowledge of the Sun, of which no man doubteth, Whether it be a glorious igneous Substance, endowed with the Power of Motion, Light and Heats : And yet what is less comprehended ? And no man hath an adequate knowledge of it, or of the least part of it.

§. 2. There are three things that must concur to our Conceptions of God : 1. Our *General Conceptions*. 2. Our *Metaphorical Conceptions* by way of Similitude. 3. Our *Negative Conceptions*; what God is not.

§. 3. I

§. 3. I have opened this as distinctly as I am able in my *Methodus Theologia*, Cap. 4. in the Table called *Ontologia*, the beginning to which I must refer the Reader that would be accurate and clear. I. We must conceive of God as a *Substance*, lest we think him to be nothing: And as a spiritual transcendent Substance, not univocally the same with created Substance, nor such as Man can reach to any sensible, or immediate or formal Conception of: But by the Similitude of created Substance our Conceptions may get some help.

This we call the Fundamental Conception; but it is but a Conception partial and inadequate; yet necessary, fetcht from the Similitude of the Creature, whose *Matter* or *Substance* is the first constitutive Conception.

§. 4. II. We must conceive of God as the prime Essential LIFE: And though God be not compounded of *Substance* and *Form*, yet from Similitude of Creatures, we must as inadequate Conceptions, think of his being LIFE, as the form of his Substance, not divisible or compounding, but as a distinguishing Conception. And *forma dat esse & nomen*.

§. 5. III. Though in God's Essence there be no *Parts*, *Degrees* or *Accidents*, yet to answer the Similitude of *Parts*, *Degrees* or *Accidents* in Man, we must put in general *Transcendent Perfection*: And this includeth abundance of his Perfective Attributes; as that He is *One*, infinite, eternal, necessary, independent, uncompounded, unchangeable, and all the rest that are contained in Absolute Perfection.

§. 6. IV. When we say, That God is the prime essential LIFE, we mean a Life of Eminency above all that is created : But yet such as must be known by *Creature-similitude* : And therefore from the Similitude of Man, we must think of the *Formal Divine LIFE* by a threefold Conception, 1. As *Vital Power in Act*, 2. As *Eminent Intellect and Will*, called *Omnipotency in Act*, *Wisdom and Goodness*, or Love. Whether these be the FATHER, SON and HOLY GHOST, is after to be opened : But as FATHER, SON and HOLY GHOST, the Scripture teacheth us to conceive of God ; As Three in One God, and One God and Substance in these Three.

§. 7. V. God is to be conceived of in relation to the Creation in general, as OF HIM, and THROUGH HIM, and TO HIM are all things : As He is the *Divine Efficient*, the more than Constitutive, and the final Cause of all.

§. 8. VI. He is especially to be conceived of in his Relations to the Reasonable Creatures, as their absolute *Owner*, *supreme Ruler* and chief *Benefactor* and amiable attractive Good and End.

§. 9. VII. He is especially to be conceived of as related to Man ; As our Creator and Conserver, as the God of Nature. 2. As our Redeemer by Christ and the God of Grace. 3. And as our Perfecter by his Spirit, and the God of Glory : And as related to his Kingdom of Nature, Grace and Glory.

§. 10. VIII. He being without Passivity a pure Act, must be conceived of, as, 1. In *virtute seu potentia Activa*. 2. In his Acts objectively immanent, 1. *Self-living*, 2. *Self-knowing*, 3. *Self-loving*. 3. In his
(a)

his transient Acts or Works, considered both *ex parte agentis*, and as the Effects.

§. 11. IX. He is negatively to be known, by the denial of all that noteth Imperfection.

§. 12. X. When I say, that God is to be known by similitudes, I mean, that though nothing be fully like to God, yet somewhat in which he may be partly known, appeareth on the whole frame of Nature; but especially on the Soul of Man, which is his Image. Therefore he that would know how to conceive of God, must first know himself, and what his own Soul is: The true Conceptions of your Souls must be the prime Helps to conceive of God by similitude.

And here you first find *Intellective, Volitive, and Executive Acts*. 2. And by these you know that you have the *Power* so to act; for no one doth that which he cannot do. 3. And hereby you know that your Souls are Substance: For all Power is the Power of some Substance: Nothing can do nothing. 4. And by this you know that an intellectual Spirit is a Substance so impowered: And that others are such as well as you: And knowing what a Spirit is, you know what God the Father is transcendently and eminently. And though all God's Works notifie him, you have thus the most intelligible Similitude within you.

§. 13. Therefore I know not how you can better conceive of God, than as MORE THAN A SOUL TO ALL THE WORLD, but especially to Saints.

I say, *More than a Soul*: For a Soul is but a *Part* and *Constitutive*; but God can be no *Part*, and is more than *Constitutive*: The World is finite, but

but God is infinite, therefore he is more than a Soul of the World: *Gassendus* calleth the World *Indefinite*, but seemeth to mean *Infinite*, and so to make God but the Soul of the World: But that cannot be proved: Not but that there be created Souls under God: But while God is more than a Soul to all those Souls, he is more than a Soul to all the World.

§. 14. It is lawful and useful to think of God, by such similitudes as he hath used of himself in his Word, how low soever. Even by his particular Works.

Three Names he assumeth; Life, Light, and Love: He is the Living God; He is Light, and with Him is no Darkness: God is Love; saith the beloved Apostle. GOD is said to cloath himself with LIGHT as with a Garment: And a man will say, I have seen the KING to day, who saw him but in his Garments: And if he saw the Skin of his Face, how little of the King did he see? In Scripture, they that have seen Angels are said to have seen God, and heard his Voice by them.

When we see the Glory of the Sun, that diffuseth its Beams to all the surface of the Earth, and uniteth it self with every Eye, even of the smallest Worms, and quickeneth every thing that liveth; this giveth us by similitude some low resemblance of the *Divine Life and Light and Glory*. When he is called *Our FATHER*, and he is said to love us as a *FATHER* his Children, this is some help to our Conceptions of him: When we read of all those Visions which *John* had in the *Revelations*, of Christ's glorious Appearance (as before on the Mount) and of God on the Throne,

with the four Beasts and seven Spirits, and the thousand thousands of glorious Attendants, and of the metaphorical Description of the Heavenly *Jerusalem*: It is not unlawful nor unuseful to us to make use of such Spectacles of Similitudes in our Thoughts of God, while we exclude all the Imperfections of such Similitudes.

§. 15. But after all, till the Love of God be shed abroad on our Hearts by the Holy Ghost, and God as LOVE look on us with his attracting and exhilarating Aspect or Communication, all these notions will be dull and barren, and will leave the Soul under fears and despondency: It is Love by vital Influence warming the Affections, that must give us a sweet taste of what we know, and overcome the fear of Death and Wrath, and give us comfortable Boldness and Courage in all the Dangers that we must go through.

And seeing Christ telleth *Philip*, *If thou hast seen or known me, thou hast known the Father*; we must by Faith see the Father in the Son incarnate, who came into our Nature, to be a Mediator of our Thoughts and Conceptions of God, and especially as he is LIFE and LIGHT and LOVE: and I think in his GLORY will in Heaven be the Mediator of our LIFE, INTUITION and FRUITION. Come Lord Jesus, *Amen*.

C H A P. 2.

Of Trinity in Unity.

§. 1. **W**hen I wrote the foregoing Treatise, I found the generality of Christians (Protestants and Papists) agreed about the Trinity; but Heresie and Debauchery encreasing together, the Case seemeth partly altered; And the ambitious, rich and worldly sort being from their Childhood bred up in fleshly pleasure, and in ignorance and contempt of serious Christianity, having really no true Religion, but a Name and Image of it, at last by their Tongues declare what is in their Hearts; and living in a Land where Atheists and Sadducees are in splendid Dwellings, whilst fear of sinning maketh Confiscations, Jails and Ruine the Lot of multitudes who are zealous Protestants, they take the advantage, decrying what they never had: But before they disown all true Religion, and declare themselves Sadducees or Brutes, they begin as Disputers, at the points where they think Difficulty will excuse them; and especially at the Trinity, and the Godhead of Christ, and *Socinian* Errors.

§. 2. I have perhaps over-tediously and prolixly handled the Doctrine of the sacred Trinity in my Latin *Methodus Theologiae*, opening the various Opinions about it, reciting the words of the Fathers, School-Doctors, and Protestants who handle it: And through the whole Book I have

shewed, That the Image of *Trinity in Unity* is imprinted by God, on the whole known frame of Nature and Government, or Morality; and that Doctrine of the Trinity, which to the ignorant is a Stumbling-block, greatly helpeth to confirm my Belief of the truth of the Gospel and Christianity, while I find it so congruous, to the foresaid Impress, and attested so much by all God's Works; especially on Man.

§. 3. It is a truth unquestionable, that without some knowledge of God there can be no true Religion, no Love to God, no Trust, no Hope, no Obedience, no true Worship of him, Prayer or Praise.

§. 4. And it is as certain that no man can have an adequate knowledge of God; that is adequate which comprehendeth the whole Object, knowing it perfectly, and leaving nothing of it unknown. And with such an adequate Knowledge we know nothing, not a pile of Grass, nor a Worm or a Hair: Much less God: With such a proper Knowledge *nihil scitur* is true, and yet *aliquid rerum* is known of all.

§. 5. Yea, it is certain, that of God, who is incomprehensible, we have here no partial Conception that reacheth so high as to be strictly FORMAL, but only such as are called analogical, equivocal, metaphorical, or by similitude. Neither *Substantia, Vita, Perfectio, Potentia, Actus, Intellectus, Voluntas, Love, Truth, Goodness, Mercy, &c.* are formally and univocally the same in God and in the Creature: *Scotus* excepteth only *ENS*. Which is true, as *ENS* is only a Logical term, signifying no more than *EST* or *Quoddity*, and not *QUID est*, or Quiddity.

§. 6. Yet

§. 6. Yet this Knowledge by similitude is not null or vain; but the greatest advancement of Man's Understanding: All that which is *formally* excellent in the Creature, is EMINENTLY and transcendently in God. Though he have not that which we call *Knowledge, Will, Love, &c.* he hath that which is infinitely more excellent, which these in Man have some likeness to, whereby we know him.

§. 7. Man's Knowledge beginneth at our selves and not at God: We do not first know God: But first we perceive our own Souls *Acts*, and thereby we know our *Power*, and our *Substance*, and thereby we know what all is that is such as we; and so what a *Spirit* is, and so what *GOD* is. As by seeing, hearing, feeling we perceive that we see, hear, feel, &c. every Sense having essentially a *self-perception*: So by thinking, knowing, willing, nilling, loving, joying, we perceive that we do it essentially; yet though the *famosius significatum* be our own *Act* as to *formality* and *priority*, it is God's as to *Eminency* and *Perfection*.

§. 8. It is certain, that as all God's Works bear some notifying Impress of his own Perfection, so Man is especially made in his Image; and therefore our Knowledge of God must there begin seeing we have no immediate and formal knowledge of him.

§. 9. As God is the God of *Nature, Grace, and Glory*, so he hath made on Man the Image of these three: 1. The natural Faculties of his Soul, are his natural Image on Man as Man: For which it is said, *Gen. 9. that blood shall be punished with blood*, because Man is made in the Image of God. 2. His moral gracious Image is Holiness, of Intellect, Will

and executive Power. 3. The Image of his Majesty, Glory and Greatness, is, 1. in all men the Dominion over the lower Creatures: 2. And in Governours a Power over Subjects or Inferiours.

§. 10. To begin where our Perception be-
ginneth, 1. It is certain, that the mental Nature
in Man hath three *distinct Faculties* in one *undi-
vided Substance*; That is, 1. *Vital Active Power*,
Intellect and *Will*: (The Vital Power being confi-
derable, first as exciting *Intellection* and *Will*, and
after as *Executive*). The same Essence or Sub-
stance is this vital Activity, Intellect and Will:
But the Active Power is not the Intellect, nor the
Intellect the Will, nor the Will the Intellect, &c.

Vid. *Vit. Georg.*
Anhalt. & Bu-
chaltrin in Melc.
Adam.

And as *Melanchton* told his Hearers,
(to the admiration of *George Prince*
of *Anhalt*, and the Duke of *Saxony*)
That the Concrete and Abstract
were here differently to be used,
we may say, that the Intellect may be said to be
willing, but not to be the Will, the Will to be *Intel-*
lectual, but not to be the Intellect, &c.

§. 11. I have fully proved in *Methodo Theol.*
parte 1. in a peculiar Disputation, that these three
Faculties are not Accidents of the Soul, but its es-
sential form in a triple, inadequate Conception, and
fully confuted all that *Zubarel* saith to the con-
trary, who epitomizeth all the *Thomists* Argu-
ments, and vindicated *Scotus*, and added many
Arguments of my own, and therefore must thi-
ther referr the doubtful.

§. 12. Not that Man's Soul is there by three
forms; for all are but one *form*: But Man's nar-
row Mind cannot conceive of them but by three
Con-

Conceptions ; which yet are not *Fictions*, but as *Scotus* calls them, **FORMALITATES**, and as *Campanella*, *Primalities* or *Essentialities* ; or as the *Nominals* extrinseck Denominations, and Relative by connotation of the Objects and Effects : He that hath a Wit subtile enough to conceive of *Scotus* his **FORMALITIES**, as noting only a *fundamentum objectivum distinguendi*, will not wonder that a Soul made in God's Image, should be of difficult Conception.

§. 13. II. The same Soul of Man hath three more general *Faculties*, that is, *mental*, *sensitive*, and *vegetative* (or *igneous*) : These are distinct, but not divided, yet are not three *Souls*, but one ; though the inferiour Operations (at least) may be alterable according to Organs and Objects ; and some uses of Senses and Vegetation cease.

§. 14. III. The sensitive Soul in Brutes hath the *Faculties*, 1. Vitally active, 2. Sensibly apprehensive, 3. Sensibly appetitive ; one of these *Faculties* is not the other, yet all are but one sensitive Soul.

§. 15. IV. The igneous Nature in Plants called *Vegetative*, hath three *Faculties*, *Motive*, *Discretive* (differencing its proper Nutriment from other things) and *Attractive* (which is assimilative) yet all are but one substance.

§. 16. V. The Sun and all igneous substances, have their *formal Powers*, that is, *Motive*, *Illuminative*, and *Calefactive* : The motion (in power or act) is not formally the *Light*, nor is the *Light* the *Heat*, nor is the *Heat* the *Light* or *Motion* : Nor are these three *Suns* or *Substances*, but one Substance is in all three, whose form we necessarily conceive of by this triple inadequate Conception.

ption. And thus it is in all the Creatures of Active Nature, which the Receptivity of the Passive also answer; and as I have proved elsewhere through all Morality also.

Melancthon, Loc. Com. per Maulium, p. 3, 4. mentioneth many such instances in the Sun, in Astronomy, in Musick, in Geometry, in Grammar, in Arithmetick; to which Logick and Politicks might be added, All Effects have only three Causes, which in the general of Causality are one; that is, the Cause efficient, Constitutive, and Final. For Matter, Receptive-disposition (called Privation) and Form, are but the three parts of the Constitutive Cause. My *Meth. Theol.* instanceth in many more.

§. 17. It is certain that the three grand Attributes, Principles, Primalities, Essentialities, or Formalities (as men diversly call them) of which the three Faculties of the Soul are an Image, are in God, not univocally the same as in Man, but eminently and transcendently. And his other Attributes (of Truth, Mercy, Justice, &c.) are these variously exercised and related; that is, *Vital-act*, *Intellect*, and *Will*, called as Perfect, Omnipotent Activity, Omniscience (or Wisdom) and Goodness of Love. And I have proved (*ubi supra*) that these are not Accidents in God, but his Essence, in a threefold formal Conception, truly distinguishable; some say *Ratione rationata*; some say *formaliter*, and some, *ex connotatione & relatione ad objecta*, and perhaps all little differ in Sence.

§. 18. All Theologues agree, That G O D must be said to be essential Life, Self-knowledge and Self-love, to be essentially *sui-vita*, *se-scire*, & *se-amare*; and that these are best exprest by Substantives abstractly, and not only in the Concrete by Adjectives

or Verbs, *sui-vita, sui-scientia, sui-amor*. Thus far there is no doubtfulness.

§. 19. As in man we must conceive inadequately of the three prime Faculties distinctly (not separatingly) 1. As in *virtute vel potentia*. 2. As in *actū immanente ad se*. 3. In *actū transeunte ad alia*, so must we inadequately conceive of them as eminently in God.

§. 20. It is undeniable, that GOD is CREATOR, REDEEMER and SANCTIFIER; the God of *Nature, Grace, and Glory: Vita, Medicina, Salutis*. And though *Father, Son and Holy Ghost* are all these, yet usually in Scripture, *Creation* is said to be the Work of the *Father* (by the Son and Spirit, and Redemption the Work of the Son (sent by the Father) and *Perfection* or *Sanctification* the Work of the Holy Ghost (as sent by the Father and the Son.) Therefore Baptism, which is our Christening, bindeth us in Covenant to God, as in these three Relations (which I hope may be easilier understood, than all the Schoolmens Disputes of the Trinity.) And no doubt, but our Baptism is a practical Covenant.

Thus the Trinity of Principles in Unity, is considerable (as is aforesaid) 1. Radically in *virtute Essentia*. 2. In the immanent acts of self-living, self-knowing and self-loving. 3. And *exeniter* transiently in *Creation, Redemption and Sanctification*, considered not as Effects, but *ex parte agentis*, as acting them.

§. 21. The word PERSON, by the custom of the Church, having been so commonly used, is not to be disused while it is well expounded, lest we seem by changing the word to change the Doctrine. But the Church had the same Faith before that

that word was applied to the Trinity ; and it was long before the use of it was agreed on ; some being for *Hypostasis*, and some for *Persona*, and some excepting against both, but not knowing what word to substitute. And is it any Wonder that Humane Language wanteth proper words to signify that of God, which is so far above our comprehension ? So that it is not because they are wiser than he, that some except against the judicious Dr. *Wallis* for being no more zealous for this *Name*, nor peremptory for any substitute, but because they understand not so well how unfit man is to make Names for God, which he hath not made himself, and taught us.

§. 22. The bare use of the name [*Person*] by one that knoweth not what that word signifieth, doth prove no man Orthodox, but only that he useth Orthodox words ; it will save no man to use a word which he understands not. And the dislike of that word (or the word *Hypostasis*, as *Hierome* did) will condemn no man who believeth the thing, which those that understandingly use the word, do believe : The Scripture hath all necessary names of the Trinity.

§. 23. Doubtless the word PERSON of the Trinity, is of very different signification from the same word applied to Man. And what constituteth a PERSON in the Trinity, none have so curiously searched and disputed, as the Schoolmen ; yet he that shall read but what I have recited out of them (in *Method. Theol.*) will find it past the capacity of an ordinary Student to know what they mean, and impossible to reconcile them with each other. Certainly their sense of the word PERSON was never made necessary to the Christian Faith.

§. 24. Many Protestant Doctors take up with the word *πρόσωπον* ; whenas the usual sence both of that Word, and of *Persona*, is but a *Relative Person*, (not *Aquinas* and such others *Relation*, which is a *Substance*, but) properly the same *Person Natural*, as related diversly: And if this were all, no man that owneth *One God*, would question a Plurality of Persons; so one man may have the relative Person of a King, a Husband, a Father, a Captain, General, a Phylician, an Astro-
nomer, &c.

And though I hold not this Relative Personality is all that we are to acknowledge in the Trinity, yet I see no reason but in the second place it is included; that is, 1. The Relations which the Divine Vitality, Intellect and Will have to the substantiality, and to each other. 2. And the Relation which they have *ad extra* to *Effects*. And whereas it may be objected, that so God hath thousands of Relations to thousands of his Works; I answer, But he hath three grand Relations, which comprehend all the rest, as he is the God of *Nature*, *Grace*, and *Glory*, Creator, Redeemer, and *Perfector*: As he hath the three grand Attributes, which comprehend the rest. But undoubtedly this Trinity of essential Attributes which are said to be related to the substantiality, and to each other, is here in the prime *Conceptus*.

§. 25. He that placeth *Personality* in the Trinity in SELF-CONSCIOUSNESS, leaveth us to enquire of him: Q. 1. Whether it be by him presupposed or not, that there are the three foresaid Attributes called Essentialities or Formalities in one Divine *idea*, which we commonly call *Substance* or *Spirit*?

Q. 2. Whether *Conscire* being *scire*, is not the
pro-

proper Act of an Intellect, and not of a *Will*, or *executive Power*, as such? Q. 3. *Self-perception* indeed is a first and essential Act of every sensible Agent: But doth not that among men only prove *sensible Life*, which is in many *Faculties*, and is as numerous as the Acts, and not prove many persons, seeing he must be first a *Person* who shall thus act? By seeing, I perceive that I see, and by hearing, that I hear, and by tasting, smelling, touching, that I taste, smell, and touch: I know these by Intellection, but I perceive them first by essential Sensation; and so by understanding, I immediately perceive that I understand and think: And by *willing* I immediately (not know, but) by a sort of eminent Sensation perceive that I will: And by vital Action I perceive that I act. Yet these are not distinct Persons, but the acts of one Person. Perception is essential to Vitality or Sense, but not constitutive of Personality.

Q. 4. Is it *knowing ones self*, or *knowing another*, or *another's* knowing me, that constituteth Personality? I know not *my self* to be what I am *in primo instanti*; I first perceive my acts, and by the Acts I know that I have an *active Power*, and by that I know that I am a Substance, &c. Which of these maketh me a *Person*? 2. God knoweth the Acts of every Creature better than each knoweth his own; yet that is not God's Personality, as distinct from his Life: And that the Creature doth not equally know God, can be no privation of Personality to God, whatever it be to the Creature: And God's Personality was before there was any Creature.

Q. 5. To

Q. 5. To say, That they are *three Minds*, or *Spirits*, or *Substances* that do *invicem conscire*, is to say, That they are *three Gods*: And because every mental Substance hath its own active Power, Intellect and Will, it supposeth three Trinities instead of one.

Q. Though God be said to be *purus Actus*, it is *Actus imitativus* including *potentiam seu virtutem agendi*; and *scia* or Substantiality, is a necessary prior fundamental Conception; for it doth *superare capium humanum* to conceive of an Act that is not *alicujus actus*. He that causeth all substantiality and existence, is eminently existent Substance. Many have made it a Dispute, Whether the *Creature* have any *Entity*, or be a *Shadow*; but none whether *God* be so.

Obj. To be *self-conscious*, proveth *Personality*; and to be *conscious* of the act of another, proveth one the same *Person* with the other.

Ans. To be *self-perceptive*, is a good proof of a *Vital Act*; and to be *self-conscious*, is a proof of an Intellect: Indeed in *G O D* the Substance and Act, and so the Personality and *Self-perception* are not two things, but the same: But yet inadequate Conceptions must be *orderly*, and so the act conceived as the act of a *Power* and of a *Person*: And as is said, every act or faculty that hath self-perception, is not a Person.

2. And God's consciousness of the acts of *Judas*, *Herod*, *Nero*, proveth him not to be the same person with each of them (though he be infinitely more.)

§. 26. *G O D* being essential Life in pure *Act*, without any passive Power, meant by the word *P E R S O N* by the Orthodox, may be

be better spoken of his Essential *Acts* (the active Virtue included) than of Mans. If it be the *Essence*, why may not the proved Trinity of objective Conceptions, as formal, be called *Persons* or *Hypostases*? (Though many wise Men wish that a Name less liable to mistake, had been used.)

§. 27. But though I am past doubt, that in God is this Trinity of essential, formal, inadequate Conceptions or Primalities, and that the impress of them is on the Soul of Man, which is his image, and on the whole frame of Nature and Grace; yet far be it from me to say, That nothing else is meant by the *Trinity of Persons*; thus much we are sure of: There may be more to constitute that personality, than is to us comprehensible; and I doubt not but there is more, because thus much is so intelligible; seeing the Divine Nature is so infinitely far above the Comprehension of us poor Worms: But what we know not, we cannot describe, or notify to others.

§. 28. There are of late some of great Wit and Learning, who have adventured upon another sort of Description of the Trinity; Men whose parts I greatly value: (*Peter Sterry*, Dr. *H. More*, Mr. *John Turner* of St. *Thomas* Hospital; and before them some in *Germany* went some such way:) They say, that from the prime Being *emaneth*, say some, or is *created*, say others; the *son* which is the second *Hypostasis* or person, and *Matter* which is the third; and this caused *Life*, and *Matter* (the Son and Holy Ghost) are *one* indivisible, (though distinguishable) Being, there being no *Spirit* (saith Dr. *M.*) save God, that is not a *Soul* to some *Body*. Some of them tell us not whether this first produced *LIFE* and *MATTER*, be the *Univer-*
versal

universal Matter of the *World*, animated by an *universal Soul*; or whether they mean only some *prime Soul* and *Matter*, that was made or caused before the rest: But others let us know, that it is the *universal* that they mean: And if so, they must needs hold the *World*, as to all its *Spirit* and *Matter*, to be *eternal*, (though in *Particles* alterable) and to be *God* himself: The *prime Entity*, the *Life* and the *Matter*, being the *Father*, *Son* and *Spirit*: But they that hold not this *universal Life* and *Matter*, do think that *God* by a most *eminent Life* and *Spirit* that was *eternal*, did create all the rest, as *inferiour* to them.

Dr. More's Book of *Transubstantiation* (and *Mr. Tho. Beverley's*) drew me to write some *Animadversions* on this *Doctrine*, as moderating between *Extreams*; but on further consideration, I am very loth to be so venturous in a *Case* of such tremendous *Mystery*, as to meddle for or against them, lest *etiam vera dicere de Deo si incerta, sit periculosum*. Though I doubt not but their exposition of *Joh. 6.* is unsound, while they make the *Flesh* and *Blood* of *Christ*, which is *Transubstantiated*, and eaten and drunk, to be the *eternal Flesh* and *Blood* of *Christ*, a *Man* from *Eternity*.

§. 29. The difficulty of the *Controversie* which this leadeth to, Whether the *World* be an *eternal Effect* of an *eternal Cause*, or *God* from all *Eternity*, till the forming of this lower *World* and *Adam*, had no *Being* but himself? Doth deterre me from meddling with it, lest I be blinded by presuming too nearly to gaze on the *Light* that should guide me; and *God*, that is *Love*, should for my boldness be to me a *Consuming Fire*: Things revealed only as for our search.

§. 30. But the Conclusion which all this prepareth for, is this ; That whatever else besides the Trinity of Primalities before described, doth constitute the Trinity of Persons, it is rendred altogether credible to an implicit Faith, by the full Evidence and Certainty of the aforesaid Trinity of Faculties or Primalities, which are God's Image on Man's Soul, and the like imprinted on the whole Creation ; which certainly is not done in vain.

§. 31. I pass by the rest, because I have so largely handled it in *Method. Theolog.* And among the numerous Authors there cited, I desire the Reader especially to peruse the words of *Guitmundus* (*A. B.*) *Averfannus*, *Edmund. Cantuariensis*, *Richardi ad Bernard*, *Pothonis Prumensis*, with whose words I will conclude (cited pag. 103.)

“ There are three invisibles of God, Power,
 “ Wisdom and Benignity, of which all things proceed, in which all things subsist, by which all things are ruled. The Father is Power, the
 “ Son is Wisdom, the Holy Ghost is Benignity.
 “ Power createth, Wisdom governeth, Benignity conserveth. Power by Benignity wisely createth, Wisdom by Power benignly governeth.
 “ Benignity by Wisdom powerfully conserveth ;
 “ As the Image is seen in the Glass, so in the state of the Soul by Humane Nature, &c. To this
 “ Similitude of God against Man approacheth
 “ neatly, to whom God's Power giveth Power to
 “ Good, and his Wisdom to Know, and his Benignity giveth to Will. This is the threefold
 “ Force of the Rational Soul, *posse, scire, velle*, to
 “ be able, to know, to will ; which co-operate to
 “ Faith, Hope, and Love (or Charity).

§. 32. Among all the Attempts that are published for our Conceptions of the Deity and Trinity, I know of none that give us their Notions with greater Confidence and Pretence of Revelation, than *J. P. M. D.* [*Dr. Pondage*] and his Leader *Jacob Behmen*. Many other of the German Prophets, going near the same way; as *C. Beckman* describeth them. *J. P.* his *Abyssical Theologia* pretendeth to far greater discovery of the Deity and Trinity, and the World, than ever Christ, Prophets or Apostles gave us. First, In his *Orbe of Eternity*, or the Divine Essential World pictured by; 1. An Eye (the Father); 2. A Heart (the Son); 3. And the Effluvia, or breathed Beams (the Holy Ghost) with the innumerable Progeny of such Eyes flowing from that pregnant Essence, differing from it only as *lesser* from *greater*, each an Individual yet making no Composition (but Unity) in the Deity.

Secondly, In his *Abyssal Nothing*, or World of Potentialities.

Thirdly, In his *Eternal Nature*, and the septenary included Worlds, &c.

But, 1. I confess there are many things in him (and in *Peter Sterry*) which Reason left to its conjectures, would think plausible; but short of *Aristotle* and *Plato*.

2. And he is so high in his Description and Defence of *Trine-Unity*, that even where I consent not, I dare not call him therein unsound.

3. But many Passages in his Description of *Eternal Nature* are apparently the effects of Ignorance, and erroneous.

4. And he goeth further in his making this *Nature eternal*, and a World, that is the Body of God, than I dare do.

5. And though I would not be too forward, to contemn men that pretend to know such Mysteries by *Vision* and *Revelation*, yet I resolve to take Christ for my sufficient and infallible Teacher; and to pretend to know no more of the Deity and unseen World, than he hath thought meet to reveal: For no man hath seen the Father at any time, but the only begotten Son; nor doth any else know him but he, and those to whom he reveleth him: And what Christ hath not revealed of God, I think it is because it is fittest for us to be yet ignorant of it, as a necessary difference between our present and our future state. To search for more will but confound and lose us; and resting practically in what Christ hath revealed, and for the rest, trusting our selves fully in his Knowing for us, his Love to us, and his Promise for us, may safely and sufficiently quiet the Mind that can be well quisted no other way.

C H A P. 3.

Of the Incarnation and Hypostatical Union.

S. 1. **N**O wonder that it seemeth hard to Man, to understand how the Divine Nature assumeth the Humane into Union, when it is so far beyond our reach to conceive how God is near to all his Works, and how he operateth on every man. Christ hath told us, That
we

we know not how a man is born of the Spirit, no more than we know whence the Wind cometh and whither it goeth: And can we easilier know how God became Man?

§. 2. It is certain, that God being infinite, is as near to us as is possible; our Souls can be no nearer to our Bodies, nor perhaps to themselves. And though Philosophers dispute, Whether Spirits be *in loco*, and whether God be in us, or we in him, and whether he be *quasi locus & spatium* to the World; yet it is past question, that he is omnipresent, and intimately *proximus* to all things.

§. 3. It is not therefore his meer *Presence* or *Proximity* of being that is this Hypostatical Union; else it would extend to all the World. It is harder therefore to prove, that God is not as nearly united to all, than to prove, that he is not so united to the Humane Nature of Christ. Which caused *Peter Sterry* and such others, to hold, That Christ hath three Natures; that is, That the Divine Nature first produced the prime, superangelical, emanant Nature, (by which he seemeth to mean an universal Soul to the Matter of the World) and that this superangelical Nature did unite it self to all, but eminently to the humane Nature of Christ, which he calleth *One top-Branch* in the Tree of Beings. Some say the superangelical Nature being Christ's only Soul assuming but a Body; others, that it assumed a *Body and Soul*.

§. 4. The grand difficulty about God's Unity with the World, and the World with God, is how to solve the difficulty that hath stalled the School-Doctors; That if the Creature have no

Entity distinct from God's, it is either part of God, or nothing: But it is not nothing, or no Substance (though some call it a *shadow*.) And it is not a *part* of God; for to be *pars*, is to be imperfect, and so to be no God. And if it have a real Entity distinct from God's Entity, then there would be more Entity in *God and the Creature*, than in *GOD alone*: For two is numerally more than one; and two *Entia* have more Entity than one, how small soever the lesser be. And then God should be but part of Universal Entity, which is Imperfection. To say that the Creature hath part of Created Entity, but not of Divine Entity, seemeth to yield, that God is but part of Universal Entity. To avoid which, many Philosophers take up the Opinion, that the whole being of all Worlds is *GOD*, the *material Part* being his Body, and the *eternal Spirit* the Soul.

What shall we say to this? To silence it will not silence the Objectors. And sure we must not grant them, *That the World is God*; or that it is part of God; or that God is but a *part* of Real Substance or Entity; or that to be so is no Imperfection. Is there no other sounder way?

Though Divines say, that *Dei non sunt accidentia*, and it's true, That *God is all Essence* and *per essentiam operatur*, yet I dread to assert, but humbly ask, Whether rather than fall into any of the former Opinions, it be not less dangerous to say, That as God hath made his Works in his likeness, and no Substance is without all Accidents, so the World be not *quasi accidens Dei*. And if so, it is no *Part* of Him, *essential* or *integral*: And as its Substance is not univocally such

as God's, so such as it is, it is so totally caused by and dependent on God's continual Creating-will and Emanation, that its *Substance* and *Being* is more *G O D's* (though not *G O D*) than its own, and so is no Addition of Being to God's Being, but contained in him, and flowing from him: A man's actual thought, words or sensation is no Addition to a man's substance as such; and yet they are not nothing. A man's Hair and Nails that have no life, but vegetative, are substantial Accidents, and yet no part of the man: And yet are so wholly his own, caused by his Soul, as heat and moisture, that we use not to call them any addition to the man's being.

§. 5. *Q.* But wherein then lieth the Hypostatical Union, if God be equally near to all things? *Ans.* He doth not equally operate on all: As the God of Nature, he sustaineth and operateth on all his Creatures: As the God of Grace, he worketh *Holiness* on Believers Souls: As the God of Glory, he is present demonstratively and gloriously to the Blessed: But he worketh on none as he did on the humane nature of Christ: These three differences I conceive make this proper sort of Union. 1. Some Works God doth, though by essential Proximity, yet not without the use and operation of second Causes: But Christ's assuming the humane nature by the divine, was by Conception by the Holy Ghost, as the immediate Efficient, without the Causality of Man or Angel, the Mother affording Matter and Aliment to the *fœtus*.

2. Divine Operations being various, the Divine Nature did that on the Humane Nature of Christ, which it did not on any other Creature: He ha-

ving such Work to do, as no other Creature was to do, the divine nature fitted the humane for its part. No Angel was to be Mediator between God and Man, and to work Miracles as he did, and in our nature to fulfill all Righteousness, and be a Sacrifice for Sin, and to rise from the Dead, and to send down the Spirit, and ascend to Glory, and there to reign and to judge the World: Therefore he was qualified for all this work.

3. And so there is also a relative difference, in that the Divine Nature, by a fixed Decree and Will, united it self for this work, to this one humane nature, even for all futurity. It may be some that are wiser can better tell wherein the Hypostatical Union consisteth.

§. 6. As to the Question, Whether the divine and humane nature be *two* or *one*, it is to ask, Whether the nature of God and his Creatures be two or one? They may be called *one* as we are *one* with *Christ*, as conjunct, related and consenting: But not one and the same essential nature.

§. 7. But the great difficulty is, whether the two natures constitute one Person, or two. *Nestorius* is accused (*Derodon* saith falsely, citing his own plain words) to have held, That *Christ* was *two Persons*, divine and humane. But what is to be held, the School-Doctors make a difficult question; that is, whether the humane nature be either a *Person*, or any part of the *Person* of *Christ*.
 1. They say, that *Christ* was a divine Person from Eternity, and therefore began not to be such at his Incarnation. 2. That the divine nature cannot be *pars personæ*, for that would be to be imperfect and not divine: Therefore that the humane

mane nature is no part, but an adjunct to the Person of Christ. (And if the humane nature be an Accident to the divine in Christ, why must we deny Creatures to be Accidents of God ?) But most plain Christians would be startled to hear a Preacher say, that the Humanity is no part of the Person of Christ.

§. 8. I have no answer to the difficulty, unless I may distinguish of the sence of the word *P E R S O N*, and say, that in the sence as it signifieth a Person in the Essence of God, the humane nature is no part of it. But as to a *Relative Personality*, (as a King, a Priest, a Prophet, &c. as a Husband, a Father, &c. are Persons) so there is one *Mediator* between *G O D* and Man, the Man Christ Jesus : And the humane is not here excluded.

Such a noise do the Histories of Church-Faction make about Nestorians, Eutychians, Monothelites, &c. that will not permit us to pass by these points.

But is the Divine a part of the Person of a Mediator ? I handle such things with fear ; The Lord pardon our weakness : But we are called to handle them by men's Presumptions.

1. As God is not a *part* of the *World*, or universal Substance, and yet is *eminenter* more than a part, what if it be so answered here ?

2. But if, as great Doctors now maintain, Relations may be ascribed to God, without any Composition, because they have no proper reality, but a meer objective comparability, why may not the divine nature have a relative part in the Relation of Mediator, as assuming and advancing the humane, and operating in it, without composition ? And as according to this ambiguity, Christ may have

have two persons (not univocally) divine and mediatorial, so the divine and humane may make one Mediator : And in the one Person of a Mediator are contained many Relative Persons of Christ, as King, Priest, Prophet, Son of *Mary*, &c. The Lord pardon what is amiss in these Conceptions, and rectifie my Judgment, and give me that practical Faith and Knowledge of Him, which constituteth Christianity, according to the Baptismal Covenant, and which is it that He calleth *Eternal Life*. Amen.

C H A P. 4.

How to conceive of the Diversity of God's Operations, seeing he is immutable, and intimately near to every Patient.

§. 1. **I**T is certain, That no Change wrought by God, signifieth any Change in God; and that no diversity of Effects signifieth any real Multiplicity or Diversity in God : But all Diversity floweth from Unity, and Change from Immutability.

§. 2. It is certain, That God is intimately present in Essence with every Creature, and every Effect, and so all his Effects are *immediatione proximitatis* immediately from God, he being as near the Effect, when he useth second Causes,

ses, and having as much Causality in producing what is done, as when he useth none.

§. 3. Yet it is certain, That God useth second Causes, and therefore that all Effects are not so immediately from him, as to be *sine mediis*: And the highest usually work on the lower.

§. 4. Therefore it seemeth plain, that Energy, or utmost transient Operations go not as far as his Essential Presence; nor are equal to his Omnipotency: He doth not all that *in primo instanti*, he can do; but suspendeth freely such Acts.

§. 5. Therefore God may so far suspend some Operations on inferior Patients, as to confine them to the Capacity or Aptitude of the superior created Causes, as he doth in the ordinary Course of Nature: He shineth not by the Moon so much as by the Sun; nor in a cloudy day so much as in a clear; nor in the night as in the day; and nourisheth us, not by every sort of Food alike, nor cureth alike by all Medicines.

§. 6. As God doth thus in Naturals, so may he do in Morals, or spiritual Changes: As he is the God of Kingdoms and People, he may use his Mercies and Judgments by Kings and Magistrates, and according to their good or bad Dispositions, as he did in the Death of Christ. He doth not use to govern Nations as happily by wicked, tyrannical, infidel Rulers, as by the good and faithful: Pagan Rome was more unhappy under Nero, Domitian, Commodus, Heliogabulus, &c. than under Nerva, Trajan, Adrian, Antonine, Alexander Severus: And the Empire was delivered by the fall of seven Tyrants, by a Constantine.

§. 7. So God usually prospereth or afflicteth Churches and particular Souls, working his Grace
ac-

according to the qualifications of the Pastors and Teachers; and fitting them to be meet Instruments of the intended Good, though he do not always so confine his Operations. This is evident in the different successes of Ministers that are skilful or unskilful, wise or ignorant, good or bad, concordant, or schismatical: And it is notorious in the success of the Education of Youth, in Schools, Universities, and Families.

§. 8. According to this Method, we may judge also of God's working according to variety of Company-helps, Temptations, and Hindrances, and how much of God's Work of Grace is thus sapientially and mediately exercised; though as to the internal manner of the Agency of his Spirit, we are told by Christ, That every one that is born of the Spirit, is as the Wind bloweth where it listeth, and we hear the sound, but know not whence it cometh, and whither it goeth. It is much herein to know a little.

§. 9. It greatly darkeneth us in judging of God's Providences on Earth, as to the ^m Welfare or Misery of Nations and Souls, Believers and Infidels, Peace and War, &c. that we know not how much God doth here by Spirits good and bad; and how far such Spirits are left to their Free-will, as *Adam* was, in their Ministration and Executions here below. God gave *Satan* power over *Job*, and power on the *Sabeans* that robbed him, and power on the Fire that fell from Heaven on his Estate. Christ said, *This is their Day, and of the Power of Darkness*. What Laws the superiour Worlds are under, as to us, and one another, is much unknown to us; yea, what power for our sins *Satan* may have against (not only the wicked

ed, but) even those that fear God, both on their Bodies by Diseases, and on their minds by troubling and seducing Temptations. Sad experience telleth us, that yielding to former Temptations, giveth him advantage for easier access to our imaginations, and to more dangerous fresh Assaults.

§. 10. But yet we may be sure, that all God's Promises shall be fulfilled, and that he will never give Satan power to break them, nor suspend his Operations so much on any second Causes, as to violate any word of safety, and hope that he hath given us to trust to; which Assurance may serve to keep us in Faith, and Hope; and Comfort.

CHAP. 5.

Is any point of Faith above Reason, or contrary to it?

§. 1. I Have answered this at large in *Method. Theol.* It is a confused and ill-worded Question.

Distinguish, 1. between *Faith* taken *objectively*, and *Faith* *subjectively* as an *Act*, or *Quality*.

2. Between that which is required of all men to be believed, and that which is required but of some.

3. Between *Reason* in *Faculty*, and *Reason* in *Act* and *Habit*.

4. Between *Reason* advanced by improvement, and *Reason* unimproved and buried in Ignorance.

5. Between *Reason* that hath only the Revelation

tion of common Nature, and *Reason* that hath supernatural Revelation.

§. 2. I. It being only objective Faith that is meant in the Question; that is no Object of Faith which for want of Revelation, a man is not bound to believe. There are Millions of Things above our Reason, which are no Objects of our Faith. And more may be the Object of one Man's Faith, than of anothers that had it no way revealed to him.

§. 3. II. Almost all the matter of Faith is *above* the Reason of ignorant Sots that never improved their Reason, or studied the Evidences of Truth: It is above their Reason, as *dispositive* and *active*, though not above the possibility of their Faculties being better cultivated and disposed hereafter.

§. 4. III. The Doctrine of Faith is not only *above*, but *contrary* to the *false reasoning* of ignorant deceived Fools; for so is the very Being of God, and such are many that boast of Reason.

§. 5. IV. The Gospel of Christ, and many points of Faith are above his Reason that hath only such natural Light as the Creation can give him, without any Gospel supernatural Revelation. Who can know in *India* that never heard of Christ, that he was incarnate, and rose from the dead, and ascended, &c.?

§. 6. V. Nothing that God commandeth us to believe, is either *contrary to*, or *above* Reason (that is the reasoning Intellect) informed by Evangelical Revelation or Notice, and honestly and soundly qualified to judge otherwise, as Law, Physick, Astronomy, so Divinity is above the Reason of the unqualified.

§. 7. This is apparent, 1. Because we have no Faith in us, but what is an act of Reason and rational Will; and therefore that cannot be said to be *above* Reason, which is it self essentially an Act of Reason. By what Faculty do we believe, but by the rational Intellect and Will? And this Intellect hath but two sorts of Acts, 1. Immediate *Self-perceptions*, which some call *Intuitions*, and some, *Eminent Internal Sensation*. 2. Abstrative Knowledge by Reasoning. And the first way we perceive nothing but our own Acts: Therefore it must be the latter, or not at all.

§. 8. 2. We have reason to know that God cannot lye; and reason to know by certain Proof that Scripture is his Word; and reason to know what that Word expresseth. Therefore we have reason to believe that it is true, and consequently to trust it.

§. 9. 3. If we tell Infidels that we have no Reason our selves for our Faith, nor any Reason to give them why they should believe Christ more than *Mahomet*, and the Scripture more than the *Alcoran*, this preaching is not the way to convince the World, nor did such Preaching gather the Churches.

§. 10. When the Apostles added Miracles to their Testimony of Christ's Resurrection, what was it for, but to convince Mens Reason, that what God so attesteth by unimitable VVorks, must needs be true: It is by reason (abused) that Men talk against reason.

§. 11. Those knowing Divines that tell the *Socinians*, That the Matters of Faith are *above* Reason, can reasonably mean no more, but that meer Reason by natural Light, could not have known

known them without Gospel supernatural Revelation.

§. 12. This Reason is unanswerable.

That is certainly true which God obligeth all men of Reason, to whom it is revealed, to believe.

But God obligeth all Men of Reason, to whom it is revealed, to believe the Life to come, and that Christ is the Son of God, and his Word true.

Therefore it is true.

The *Major* is proved by the very Being and Perfection of God; to say that God bindeth the World to believe a Lye, and so is the great Lyer and Deceiver, is to describe him like Satan, and to deny him to be God.

The *Minor* is proved; God bindeth us to believe that which being of greatest everlasting Consequence, is attested by the former Prophecies, the Essential Impressions of God, the multitude of uncontrolled Miracles, and the continued success of sanctifying Souls, and making the greatest amendment of the world, when we have no Disproof of it; and to trust our Souls and Hopes on this, when we have such sealed Promises and no other sufficient Hopes.

But such is the Gospel of Christ, and the Life to come—*Ergo* we are sound as reasonable, by God to believe it.

In this Belief and Hope I am writing this, under the sentence of Death, in expectation of my approaching Change.

¶ These five preceding Chapters were, on Emergent Occasion, written about Twenty years after the rest of the Book (see the Chapter, Chap. 5.)

CHAP. I. Prefatory.

*Who shall be Judge of Controversies, and of the
Sense of Scripture ; whether all the People, or
who else.*

Sect. I. **E**Xperience assuring all Men, that we
are born without actual Know-
ledg, and yet with Faculties made
to Know, obliged to Learn, desi-
ring Knowledg, needing it, and delighting in it,
no wonder if Men be inquisitive after the surest
and easiest way to attain it ; and if they be unwill-
ing to be deceived, no wonder they love Truth as
Truth, and hate Lyes as Lyes ; though, being de-
ceived, they hate that which is Truth, and love
that which is a Lye.

§. 2. Therefore the first Apprehensions of the
mind do greatly tend to the introduction of those that
follow ; to make them such as shall agree with these :
And here, 1. *Sense*, and 2. *Education* have the great
advantage. 1. We exercise Sense before Reason,
and therefore, at first, without the government of
our own Reason, and this necessarily, strongly, and
constantly, as the Bruites do. 2. And being there-
fore governed by the Reason of our Parents, we
learn Knowledg of them, and from sensible Objects,
but drop by drop, by slow degrees ; and Sense be-
ing strong, inclineth Children strongly to desire
that

that sort of Knowledg, which will most serve the pleasure of Sence and Fleshly Appetite : And so they easily learn how to sport, and after how to seek Provision (by Labour and Trades, and Flattery, &c.) to satisfy the Desires of the Flesh. But the knowledg of things spiritual and everlasting, which are beyond the reach of Sight and all the Senses, cometh not in so soon, nor till Parents or other Teachers tell them of such, or Reason grow up to maturity, by Experience and serious Exercise, and withal, the Grace of God to bless such Helps, and overcome the contrary fleshly inclinations, which original Pravity and customary Sensuality, raise up against the Desires of, Endeavours for, and Obedience to a spiritual and more excellent Knowledg. Where God giveth, 1. A Body moderately temperated as to Sensuality and Incontinuity ; 2. And Parents, or first-Teachers, wise and faithful, to teach Children that spiritual Knowledg which they have learnt themselves ; and, 3. by His Grace exciteth Childrens Minds to love, learn, and obey the Truth, there enter the beginnings of truest Wisdom : But where these are wanting, they grow up, instead of saving Wisdom, to the craftiness of a Fox, to get, keep, and devour his Prey, and to the valour and felicity of the Mastiffe, to be Master of the little Dogs ; and at last, to the subtilty of Devils, to oppose and destroy as a hated thing the Holy Wisdom and Practice that should have saved them.

§. 3. As Knowledg cometh in by slow degrees, so there are as many degrees or differences of it, in the World, as there are Men ; it being not probable that any two men on Earth have just the same apprehensions and degrees of Knowledg ; but that
all

all mens mental Complexions differ far more than their Visages do. So that if the same degree were the measure of necessary Church-Concord, and Salvation, there should but one in the World be *the Church* or be *saved*. The question then is not, What measure is *desireable*, but what is *necessary* to Church-Unity and Communion, and to Salvation. And what God will do with those that have not the Gospel, and are not of the Christian Church, but only *believe that God is, and that he is the Rewarder of them that diligently seek him, and that in every Nation do fear God, and work righteousness*] belongeth not to our present question; but only what is necessary to the *Christian State and Hope*.

§. 4. And here it is first to be decided, *Whether God hath by any fixed Law or Revelation determined so of the Measure of Christian Knowledge and Faith, as that thereby men may know who are to be taken as Christians and of the Church?* To which I say, 1. We must distinguish of Faith as *objective* and as *Active*, or as to the *matter believed*, and as to the *Act of believing or knowing*. 2. Between the *Inward Sincerity* and the *Outward Profession*: And remember that though God judge of Men according 1. to inward Sincerity, and 2. expect that *degree of Knowledge and Faith* in Act and Habit suitable to means enjoyed; without which the man and his Faith are not indeed *sincere*; yet the Church (and all Men) can judge of others, but 1. *By outward Profession*, 2. extended to that degree of *Objective Faith*, which God hath made commonly necessary to Christianity or to the acceptance of the Church

It is therefore here a deceiving Confusion, to confound the two cases, what is necessary to *God's acceptance into Heaven*, and what is necessary to a

Man's acceptance into the Church. And thence some conclude that no man can tell just what is necessary to Individuals.

§. 5. That Christ hath stated the Essentials of Christianity, taken objectively should be so far past question, as our Christianity it self is, at least. For if he have not, then he is not the Author and Finisher of our Faith: And if he be not who is? The Apostles delivered it as received from him. If it were not then made and determined by Christ, then there was then no Christianity, and so no Christians. And if it was made since then, who was the Maker of Objective Christianity? No Man or Company of Men dare or do pretend to it. If they should, whence had they that Power? And did it die with them? Or may others after them make also a new Christianity? *Paul* pronounceth Angel or Man accursed that should bring another Gospel than that which he had received and preached, *Gal.* 1. 7, 8. *1 Cor.* 15. 3, 4. &c.

2. And if the Essentials of Christianity and Church-relation and Communion were not determined of by Christ, and notified in the Holy Scriptures, then there could be then no Christian Church, for want of Church-Essentials. And then when began that Church, and who made it.

3. But the Gospel hath put the matter out of doubt, telling us that Christ hath actually declared and determined the Essentials of Objective Christianity and the Church: even in his Institution of Baptism, which is our Christening, which in his preaching he expounded, and so did his Apostles.

2. And as his Baptized Disciples were called *Christians*, so he commanded them to Love one another and live in Concord and Communion as
Chri-

Christians : and could any obey this Command, if Christianity was then either unmade or a thing that could not be known ?

§. 6. And if it was then made by Christ, it was surely unchangeable : else men might be still making a new Christianity, from Age to Age, and when should we have an end ? And who hath power or skill to make a better than Christ made *Mahomet* that attempted it, thereby is an accursed Antichrist ?

§. 7. And now we come next to enquire,
I. *What are the Church-Controversies to be decided.*
II. *And who are the Dissenters that differ herein.*
III. And then we shall easily find who it is that must be the Judge of them.

§. 8. And 1. it is supposed that *it is no one essential part of Objective Christianity that is in Controversie.* 2. And that it is not among Christians that any such point is controverted. For he that denyeth any essential part, denyeth Christianity and the Church ; and therefore is no Christian (whatever he may be called by himself or others.) And though Confounders make a great Controversie of it, whether a Heretick be a Christian and a part of the Church, it's easily resolved ; if we dally not with an ambiguous word : If by a Heretick be meant one that professeth not, or deny'd any essential part of Christianity or the Church, he is no Christian nor part of that Church which he denied : But if by a Heretick be meant one that professeth not, or denyeth only something that is of the *melius esse* of Christianity and the Church, he is a Member though a faulty one.

§. 9. But it will be said, that *more than the Essentials of Christianity is necessary to Church-Communion :*

else we must receive Drunkards, Fornicators, Extortioners, Railers, with whom, saith St. Paul, we must not eat.

Ans. I would those that will not endure tolerable men for a different opinion or circumstance, could as little endure Drunkards, Fornicators, Extortioners, and Railers, and Covetous, &c. But the Objectors must understand, That as I said, *The Baptismal Covenanting Profession of Christianity* is our Church-title to its Communion. And that *Christianity* is more than a bare Opinion or Notional Assent: it is a solemn giving up our selves by Vow and Covenant to God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, as our God and Saviour and Sanctifier, to be Taught and Ruled by Christ, as well as pardoned, adopted, and glorified; which essentially containeth Repentance and the Renunciation of the Dominion of the Flesh, the World, and the Devil, which are contrary to the Government of Christ.

And it must be remembered that a *Verbal Profession* proved counterfeit and false by inconsistent contradiction in word or deed, is indeed not valid, and is no *Profession*. And he that would say, I will be Ruled by Christ, but I will be a Drunkard, a Fornicator, an Extortioner, &c. would thus nullify his Profession by a gross Contradiction: And to live impenitently in these sins, is as sure a proof of falshood of a man's Profession, as contrary words would be. And if a man once and again commit such Sins till he Repent of them, he chooseth them and liveth in them: And while he chooseth and liveth in them, he Repenteth not indeed, whatever he say: For Repentance is a change of Mind and Life.

There-

Therefore we here distinguish of Mens Right to Church-Communion as 1. unquestioned, 2. as lost or null, 3. as doubtful and under tryal. 1. A Baptismal Profession of all the Essence of Christianity, and not disproved, is a Title not to be questioned. 2. Apostasie, or the denial by word or deed of any essential part of Christianity, justly proved, nullifieth Christianity and Church Right. 3. But if a man speak or hold some bad opinion by a remote unseen consequence, contrary to somewhat essential to Christianity, or if he commit some Sin that is inconsistent if he Repent not, here the Church must try whether the said *Error* be indeed so held, as that the contradicted truth is really not held, or only be held on a mistake of consistency, the person professing to renounce it, if inconsistent: And whether the said Sinner live impenitently in that Sin, as that which he chooseth and will not forsake: And while the man is under this doubtful *Tryal*, his Title is doubtful, and to be suspended as to actual Exercise.

And therefore the Church hath ever used *Suspension* as a thing different from a full or proper Excommunication: *Suspension* and some *disciplinary* restraints, have been called *Excommunicatio minor*, which doth not cut off a man from the Church: When the proper Excommunication called *major*, is but an Authoritative Declaring that a man hath cut off himself, by *Apostasie* at least from some *essential part* of Christian Faith or Duty: without which self-abscision, other mens hath no place, and is but a Slander of the innocent. God hath not given others Power to unchristen, cut off or damn the guiltless.

§. 10. It's one thing to be cut off from the Church or Christ, 2. and another to be under tryal and suspense o actual Communion, till Repentance prove mens Right. 3. And it's another to be at present only denyed Communion (not with the Church wholly, but) in some comfortable Ordinances, till the removing of a Scandal have made the person capable, by satisfying the scandalized. 4. And its another thing to be cast down from a higher to a lower station, and denyed Dignities, Preferments, and special Honour. Confound not these.

§. 11. And by this time you may see how to answer the ill-stated question, *Who is the Judge of Controversies in Religion: and of the Sence of the Scripture: and whether every ignorant Man or Woman, or Child must be Judges of it for themselves?*

And first you must understand the foresaid *Distinctions* necessary to the *Solution*; Ambiguities and Generalities are the instruments of Deceit. And secondly I shall apply them to the case.

§. 12. 1. We must distinguish Controverted *Essentials* of Christianity, from controverted *Integrals*, and *Accidents*.

2. Distinguish Controversies between Christians and no-Christians, from Controversies among Christians.

3. Distinguish material Objective Christianity (Faith and Duty) from internal Subjective.

4. Distinguish *external valid Profession of Actual Faith* not disproved, from *internal Sincerity*.

5. Distinguish between what is necessary to God's accepting a man to Justification and Salvation; and what's necessary to the Church's accepting a man to Communion.

6. Di-

6. Distinguish what is necessary to that stated Union and Communion which is our real Church-Membership and Christianity, from that which is necessary to the present actual exercise of such Right in some local Priviledges and Acts; and from that which only fitteth men for Dignity or Office.

7. Distinguish between the Case *de esse*, or real Truth, and the Case *de scire*, or judging of it.

8. Distinguish between Judging what others shall *Believe* about things controverted, and governing their Practice, how they shall behave themselves.

9. Distinguish a private Judgment, discerning what is or is not our own Duty, and a *publick Judgment* in Government of others.

10. Distinguish the Judgment of several Governours according to their divers Offices, and Ends.

11. Distinguish a limited Power to Judge only one way from a power of judging obligatively *in partem utramlibet*, this way or that.

12. Distinguish the real incomplex Matter or Objects of Faith, from the literal complex words which signifie them. And so these conclusions will be clear past doubt.

Concl. 1. All Christians are agreed in the Essentials of Christianity: Therefore these are no Church-controversies for any to be the Judges of. It's only Infidels and Men without our Church that differ from us in these. And Infidels are not to be converted by the Authority of a humane Judge (nor ever were) but by *Teachers* shewing the Evidences of Truth.

C.II. All Christians, as such being bound by Christ to love one another, and live in Communion as
Mem-

Members of one Body, notwithstanding lesser differences, it followeth that Christian Unity, Love, and Communion depend not on the question, *Who shall be Judge of Controversies*; as being presupposed to it.

C. III. But the Baptizing Pastors of the Churches are by office the Judges, whether it be indeed the Essentials of Christianity which are profest by the Baptized.

C. IV. And therein it is the Real incomplex Objects that are *propter se* essential (God, Christ, Grace, &c.) And the signal words are only necessary to notify to the Church what men believe: And no singular words only are necessary: Else only men of One Language could be Christians: But any words will serve which signify the same Matter: few will serve for some: and others must use more. The words of Baptism suffice where they are understood: But the Creed, Lord's Prayer, and Decalogue, as the sum of the *Credenda, Petenda, Agenda*, have by the Church been judged a sufficient explication, for the Baptized: And in these we all agree.

C. V. Though real sincerity of active Faith and Consent be necessary to Salvation, God judging the Heart; yet Profession not disproved, must satisfy the Church: Who therefore are not put to judge whether mens Knowledge reach the degree of their Helps?

C. VI. The Baptizing one into the Union of the Church-Universal, obligeth him to exercise Christ's instituted Worship in particular Churches; and therefore to know what that is: which is The Pastor's *Teaching the Flock, Christ's Gospel*; officiating in the administration of the Lord's Supper, Prayer
and

and Praise, and Disciplinary Government by the use of the Church-Keys : Of Mens fitness for these, the Pastors are the Judges, and the Flock must obey.

C. VII. Christ hath in Scripture instituted all that is of necessity to this Communion.

C. VIII. Every Governour hath a governing Judgment (called *Publick*.) suitable to his Office. The Pastours are Judges who is capable of Baptism and Church-Communion, as far as must be executed by the Keys.

The Magistrate is Judge who is by him to be countenanced, tolerated, or punished by force.

The Parents are Judges in cases about their Wives and Children, proper to Family-Government

But every reasonable Creature being a Governour of himself, is necessarily the Discerner of his own Duty. And God being the Highest Ruler, and there being no Power but of Him, and none against Him, no Man must obey any against him : and all must use their Reason to judge whether Mens Laws be against God or not : If this were not so, 1. Men were governed as meer Bruites : 2. And must curse God or Christ, or murder, or do any Evil that Rulers bid them. 3. And then God should for this punish none but Sovereigns. 4. And then all Nations must be of the King's Religion. 5. And then men must not judge whether it be the Just Prince or the Usurper that they must obey. In short, this overthroweth all Religion and Humanity.

C. IX. No men have Power to Judge *in partem utramlibet*, or against any Article of Faith or Divine Obedience ; the Thing is *True* or *False* before they judge of it : and if they judge against Truth, their Judgment is void : God binds us not to believe
their

their Lie: They have no Power to judge that there is no God, no Christ, no Holy Ghost, that the Gospel is false, that Men may commit Idolatry, Perjury, Murder, Adultery, &c. The contrary all may and must judge; but some as Rulers, and some as Subjects. But in cases before indifferent, (where Man's Authority may *make Duty*, or *not*, there they may *judge it Duty or not* accordingly.

C. X. In doubtful cases no mens bare judgment can bind or make others to Believe things Divine with a Divine Faith: man is not God. But 1. *Teachers* that are credible must be believed with a human Faith according to the degree of their credibility, which is preparatory to Divine Faith. 2. And Rulers may *Govern* Subjects in the manner of expressing and using their controverted Opinions, and restrain them from doing hurt.

C. XI. While true Union and Love are secured by common concord in things essential and necessary, a Judge of other Controversies is not needful to these ends before secured: Christians must live in Love that understand not many hundred Texts or Controversies.

C. XII. It is worse than Madnes to think that all Controversies will on Earth be ended, or that any Men can do it. But they that say it do most deeply damn such pretended Judges, that so many Volumes being written of Controversies, and contrary textual Expositions among themselves, will not decide them to this day. Who shall decide all the Controversies between General Councils, and all the present Patriarchs and Churches in the World.

Thus much to answer the question, *Who shall be Judge of Controversies and Scripture Sence?*

§. 5. If Men did but difference points *necessary* to *Salvation* and *Christianity*, from those that are only needful to a *higher Stature* in the Church, and from those that are utterly *uncertain* and *unnecessary*; and, 2. If they did but know their own *ignorance* and *liableness* to *Error*; and, 3. If they considered how utterly impossible it is to make the multitude of ignorant People, yea or Ministers, to be all of a mind, in the numerous hard Controversies, Opinions, and dubious or indifferent things, that are striven about in the World; certainly instead of damning, or despising, or destroying, or hateing each other for such things, they would magnify the Wisdom and Mercy of Christ, who hath laid the Love, Unity and Peace of his Church on a few plain, sure and needful things, [*Even the Covenant of Christianity, with the Creed, Lora's Prayer and Decalogue, and so much of Christ's own Precepts, as the universal Church hath ever bin agreed in.*] And they would rather honour and obey St. Paul, Rom. 14. 1 Cor. 12. Ephef. 4. 1, to 16. than count his Doctrin to be unpracticable or loose.

§. 6. If God will take all into Heaven that practically believe the Creed, and obey what is plainly written in the Scripture, why may not such live in Love and Peace on Earth, and the Key-bearers of the Church (which is the Seminary of Heaven) receive such, as *Christ receiveth us to the Glory of God the Father*, Rom. 15. 16. What if Men confess that they know no more (when millions called Christians know not so much) will they destroy them for not knowing more than they can know? Or is it any Virtue or Duty
to

to lye, and say that they know or believe what they are utterly ignorant of? What if those that with *Jerome* disliked the word *Hypostasis*, and those that preferred it before *Persona*, had forborn censuring one another? What if the questions, *Whether Mary should be called the Mother of God, or rather of Him who is God? Or whether Christ's Will and Operations should be said to be One or Two?* had been managed with mutual forbearance, without *Zeno's* Henoticon, or *Anastasius's* forcible Amursty? What if such forbearance had spared all the rage and bloodshed at *Antioch, Alexandria* and other parts? What if *Chrysostom* and others had bin permitted to silence their Thoughts of *Origine*? What if men had not bin put to declare whether the *tria capitula* of *Theodoret, Ibas* and *Theodore Mopsuest*, were found or unsound, and said, *What is it to us?* Might not the Church have lived with such in Peace? What if when the World was in a flame about Images, they had left them only to those that desired them? Might not they yet have lived in Love, that agreed in all the Essentials of Christianity? What if yet one man say that Christ's Body is locally present in the Eucharist; and another say that, Because he knoweth not how far his spiritual Glorified Body is invisible, therefore he no more knoweth whether it be there than whether an Angel be there, but believeth that the Sacrament is truly his crucified Body representative; why might not both these live in peace? What if one think that Venial Sin must be punished with Purgatory Fire, or as an English Dr. that some men must pass a new Life of Trial, in their Aireal Vehicles, before they are capable of an

Æthereal Vehicle, why may not such bear with one that saith he knoweth no such thing? What if one man think that he may pray to his Angel Guardian, and another saith only that he oweth Angels Love, Reverence and Gratitude, and would pray to them if he knew when they heard him, and knew it were God's will, what hurt will it do to the other man to bear with this? If we agree of all points that put men into that state in which Christ commanded to Love one another as his Disciples; if others differ from me about the meaning of five hundred Texts of Scripture, why may not I be contented with my Knowledge and Opinion, and leave them to theirs? Why might not *Nazianzene* and the Council of *Constantinople*, *Hierome* and *Ruffinus*, *Chrysostom* and *Theophilus* and *Epiphanius*, *Prosper* and *Cassianus* and *Vincentius*, (to pass by *Augustine* and *Celestine* and *Julianus*, and *Hierome* and *Vigilantius* and *Jovinian*) have composed their differences with less noise and strife, and lived in love and peace together. (To pass by also the doleful Contentions about the Councils of *Ephesus* and *Calcedon*, and *Const.* 5, & 6. and *Nice* 2. and between *Ignatius* and *Phorius*, and many more worse strifes since then) Why might not the Jesuites and Jansenists have differed without troubling the Popes and the Church, by mutual forbearance and gentle disputes, as many of the Schoolmen did before them? I quarrel not with *Erasmus*, *Faber*, and abundance such, for chiding the Schoolmen as Causers of Contention, by raising so many frivolous questions for Dispute: But verily, as they were in my opinion the best Philosophers that ever the World had, (and no wonder when they studied little else) so they

they managed their Disputes with more Scholar-like candour and peaceable moderation than most that went before them, or that have followed them. How many huge Volumes of subtile Disputes do they write, with very few railing words: patiently bearing each others copious Confutations and Contradictions, as a thing to be expected, and no whit wondring at the Differences of Judgment among the worthiest men? How many Volumes, or loads of Volumes are there written; of the different Opinions of the *Thomists*, *Scotists*, *Nominals*, *Durandists*; and yet till the late times put Virulency into the Writings of *Jesuites*, *Dominicans* and *Jansenists*, &c. there was little reviling to be found in all these long Disputes.

And why might not *Luther* and *Caroloostadius*, *Zuinglius* and *Oecolampadius*; and many *Lutherans* and *Calvinists* have lived in as much Love and Peace as *Melancthon* and *Erasmus* and such others, if they had but had their forbearing Charity and Candour? How sweet are the Pacificatory Writings, yea and how judicious, of *Junius*, *Ludov. Crocius*, *Matth. Martinus*, *Georg. Calixtus*, *Conrad. Bergius*, *Johannes Bergius*, *Paraus*, *Amyraedus*, *Hottonus*, *Testardus*, *Camero*, *Lud. Capellus*, *Placaus*, and (above all) *Vinc. le Blank*: yea and of moderate Papists, *Espenceus*, *Ferus*, *Gerson*, *Cassander*, and especially *Erasmus*: And how harsh to the Lovers of Love and Peace, are such Writings as spit Fire and Brimstone, Reproach and bitter Censures, against those that be not just of their Opinions? it puts the wisest Divines hard to it, how far they may pronounce Damnation on all those Heathens, that live in Sincerity (though not in Perfection) according to that measure of the
notifica-

notification of God's Will which they are under, that come to God in the belief that God is, and that He is the Rewarder of them that diligently seek him, and that in every Nation they that fear God and work Righteousness, and are no worse than such Righteous men, as Abraham thought even wicked Sodom had had fifty of, are accepted of him. And shall Christians damn, curse and kill all that understand not a thousand Controversies, which perhaps the destroyers as little understand; and that know not an hundred things to be indifferent or lawful, which the destroyers do but say are such?

§. 7. It hath oft grieved me to read in Dr. Heylin's Life of Archbishop Land how great a hand the Controversies then called *Arminian*, or of the Five Articles, had in the Divisions of the Church of England, between those that he maketh Archbishop Abbot in England and Archbishop Usher in Ireland to Head on one part; and the few that at first (and many after) that followed Archbishop Land in England, and Archbishop Bramhall in Ireland on the other part. And to find what a stress the many Parliaments that feared Popery did lay on the thing that they called *Arminianism*: And being carried down by the stream of many good mens Opinions and Fears, I was my self some years confident that *Arminianism* was a character of an Enemy to the Soundness and Safety of the Church. But when I had set my self throughly and impartially to study it, I found that which so amazed me, that I durst scarce believe what I could not deny; even that from the beginning of the Quarrel between *Augustine* and *Pelagius*, all the Voluminous

Contentions of the *Thomists* or *Dominicans*, and the *Jesuites*, and *Franciscans*, and between the *Lutherans*, and *Zuinglians* (herein) and the *Synodists* and *Arminians*, have been mostly about either *unsearchable things*, which neither side understood, or about *ambiguous words*, which one Party taketh in one sense, and the other in another; or about the meer *methodizing* and *ordering* of the notions which both sides are agreed in; and that indeed the most reach not the very point of the difficulty and controversie, but talk before they understand as their Leaders have taught them: And that when the matter is distinctly opened, it is found that multitudes that write, rail and plot against one another, are really of one Opinion *De rebus*, and did not know it: And that the few remaining Controversies that are *real*, and not only *verbal*, are but of such small or dubious things, as should break no *Love* nor *Communion* among Christians, but all should with forbearance love each other in that liberty of judging which they cannot remedy.

The man that could cure all mens Errours (and his own) and will not, is much to blame: And he that would but cannot, is little better, if he will kill all that he cannot cure; and no doubt hath greater than any of theirs uncured in himself. And what! Do I in all this take part with Ignorance, Error, Heresie or any Sin? No! he that can cure it, let him: But is he a fit person to cure it, that hath the Errours of Ungodliness, Malice, Lying, and Bloodthirstiness in himself? Or will killing men cure them? The Charity of these men saith, [*Burn, hang or kill them lest they infect others:*] *Ergo*, say others, *Kill these that sin*

so, because their *Errours* are the most pernicious, lest they infect others with the *Asps* and *Dragons* killing *Boyson*. Nature teacheth Man to hate and kill Wolves, Kites, Adders, and all that live on the Blood of harmless Creatures, and to protect Sheep, Doves, and such other Creatures as cannot protect themselves. My nature grudgeth to live on the Flesh of these harmless Creatures, though God hath given them to us, but I little pity a Toad, a Snake, a Spider, or a devouring Fox : But *regnante Diabolo*, where the Devil ruleth, he will have his *Butchers* and *Shambles* ; and as Brutes are killed for Men, honest men shall be killed by these as for God : And because God himself will not allow the murder of the Innocent and Just and Pious, it is but calling them, Rogues and Knaves, and as Christ, an Enemy to *Cesar*, and as to *Paul*, A Ring-leader of a Sect, and Mover of Sedition among the People, (real crimes where there is real Guilt) and then they may say of them and do to them what they will, and by cheating History represent Saints as Villains to ignorant Posterity. But O blessed be the final, Just, deciding Judge ; who is as at the door. The Leech's Religion, that cannot live without Blood, is against the reliques of Humanity in Mankind, so much, that even they that for worldly interests comply with it, do secretly suspect it to be indeed Diabolism.

§. 8. But Satan told Christ that the *Kingdoms of the World* and the glory of them is delivered to him, and their Power is his Gift which he giveth to whomsoever he will ; and that shall be to those that obey and worship him, *Luk. 4. 5, 6*. Though he be a Lier, too much of this is proved by the effects.

And doubtless where he reigns, his work doth denote his Power and Government; that is, 1. *Blind Ignorance, Error, Lying and Deceit.* 2. *Malignant Hatred of good things and persons.* 3. *Bloodthirsty and destructive wolvissh ways.* And when he transformeth himself into an Angel of Light, and his Ministers as into Ministers of Righteousness, all this is done most successfully *as for God*, and as by (pretended) Commission from Christ, to kill the most conscionable and faithful Christians, as odious Villains, and that as for the Church and Christ, and for Unity, Order and Holy ends; yea to kill them in meer Charity, (though they love not such charity to themselves.) Such is the *Cainites and Cannibal Religion*, that will dye if it be not fed with Blood. And yet is so impatient of its own name, and to hear the recital of its own Exercise which hath maintained it a thousand years, that it is a mortal crime to tell men that they do that which they openly do & glory in. Wonderful! that it should be a necessary Virtue to do it, and a capital Crime to say they do it: To know what such do, goeth for worse than doing it. *Inscius Alceon, &c.*

§. 9. The effects of these Controversies have been and still are so dismal, among Papists and Protestants, that sure no man should be angry with a Reconciler that is not in love with Hatred and Destruction. I confess they are very learned men of the Church of *Rome* that have managed them against each other. And so are some of the Church of *England*, and of foreign Protestants: But I must testifie that the most that I hear or read inveighing reproachfully against others about them, are men that tell me they talk after

after their Leaders, of things that they never understood. I am ashamed to hear of't in the Pulpits: one Party rendring the Doctrine of Predestination as odious Blasphemy, and another Party crying down Universal Redemption and Free-will and Arminianism, as an Enemy to God's Grace; and neither of them know what they speak against. One *Davenant*, or *Camero*, or *Le Blank*, sheweth more insight into the Controversies which they reconcile, than forty of these zealous Railers do.

§. 10. I meddle not in this Book with the Controversies about *Church-Government* or *Worship*: A settled worldly Interest and the various mental dispositions of the Contenders, convince me, that I can there do little for reconciliation: God must do it, if he have not forsaken this world. But meer *Doctrinal* Controversies (though of great moment) methinks should not be so linked to a worldly Interest, but that men should be willing to know the Truth or to endure others to know it. That which I have attempted is, by meer and clear explication, without much argumentation, to end such Controversies: And to make men understand one another, and the things which they dispute about; and by abbreviating my *Catholick Theology*, to make the Conciliation fitter for all Students: And the Success of that Book giveth me great encouragement, which hath been unanswered to this day, when I looked that it should have brought the Contentious of both sides about my ears. And I rejoice in the Success of *Le Blank's Theses* which I publish'd (he sent them to me to publish, and I gave them to my Bookseller to print, and he sold his Copy to another.) For all the

dismal effects that the History of the low Countries, and Dr. Heylin in Archbishop Land's Life mention of these Controversies, I rejoyce that these many years last past, they have made in England less noise than ever, and are talked of with more peace and moderation. And that I have a special share in the Comfort of this effect. And what Names soever Peace-haters and Man-haters and Saint-haters call men by, Christ saith, *Blessed are the Peace-makers, for they shall be called the Children of God.*

C H A P. II.

The Doctrines about which they chiefly disagree, enumerated.

§. 1. **T**HE forementioned causes of Divisions in general, do operate among Christians, 1. About Church-Government; 2. About God's Worship, and 3. About Christian Doctrine in particular: All which are turned into the matters of our Discord. The two first I intend not to meddle with in this Discourse: And as to the third, the Controversies about Doctrine which most trouble the Churches, are, 1. About God's Decrees and His Will in general. 2. About his Foreknowledge. 3. About Election in particular. 4. About Reprobation. 5. About his Providence and Predetermination of all actions in general. 6. About his causing or not causing Sin. 7. About Natu-

Natural Power and Freewill, 8. About original Sin. 9. About Redemption by Christ. 10. About the Laws and Covenants of Innocency, Works and Grace. 11. About Universality and Sufficiency of Grace. 12. About Man's Power and Freewill since the Fall, to obey the Gospel. 13. About effectual Grace, and how God giveth it. 14. About the state of Heathens that have not the Gospel. 15. About the necessity of Holiness, and the state of moral Virtue. 16. About the necessity of Faith in Christ where the Gospel is made known. 17. About the state of Infants as to Salvation. 18. About the nature of Saving Faith. 19. About the nature of Pardon and Justification. 20. About the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness to Believers. 21. About the manner how Faith justifieth us, and how Faith is imputed to us for Righteousness. 22. Of Assurance of Justification and Salvation, and of Hope. 23. Of Good works and Merits, and how far we may trust to any thing in our selves. 24. Of Confirmation, Perseverance, and of danger and falling away. 25. Of Repentance, late Repentance and the Day of Grace, and the unpardonable Sin. 26. Of our Communion with Christ's Glorified Humanity, and with Angels and glorified Souls. 27. Of the state of separated Souls. 28. Of the Resurrection and Everlasting Life.

Of each of these I shall shew the pacifick Truth which must unite us, and shew how far all the Reformed Churches are therein agreed; and whether the Papists are or will be agreed with us, I shall refer to their own consideration.

C H A P. III.

Of God's Will and Decrees in general.

§. 1. **T**HE Will of God] signifieth either, I. His own Essence, and that, 1. under the notion of a *Power* or *Virtue* analogically to the *Faculty* in Man; or 2. under the notion of an *Act*, as it is considered only *ex parte agentis* without the effect. II. Or the said Essence as related to the *Effects* or *Objects*, and thence denominated. III. Or the *Extrinsick Objects* and *Effects* themselves, called his *Will*, because *willed* by him.

§. 2. These later are, I. His Works of eminent Power (with Wisdom and Goodness) *viz.* Creation, Preservation and Natural Motion, by God as *fons natura*. II. His Works of Eminent Wisdom (with Power and Goodness) *viz.* ORDER, and specially Moral Government; the parts of which are, 1. Legislation, Antecedent to man's actions; 2. Retribution, by Judgment and Execution, consequent to them: especially by the Redeemer in the way of *Grace*. III. His Works of Eminent Love or Goodness (with Power and Wisdom) especially *Glory* begun and perfected.

§. 3. By [God's Decrees] is meant his *Volitions* of what shall be; which are but his *Will* considered as in such acts: Now concerning all these senses of God's Will.

§. 4. I. God's Will in it self considered is his *Essence*, and not any *Accident* in God.

§. 5.

§. 5. II. Yet *esse & Velle* are not *Conceptions* of the same *sence* or *importance*; but are *distinct inadequate Conceptions* of the same *God*: And so is also *Intelligere*.

§. 6. III. As *Posse & Agere* are not really two things in *God*, so his *Will* as a *Power, Faculty or Virtue*, and his *Will* as an *Act or Volition* in himself, are not *two things*; but *two inadequate Conceptions* of that which is simple *Unity* in *God*; for *Man's* narrow mind can no otherwise know him.

§. 7. IV. *God* doth *operate* or *effect* immediately by his *Essence*; and not by any *Action* of his, which is between *his Essence* and the *Effect*: Whether you call it his *Agere, Intelligere* or *Velle*, or all conjunct by which he *effecteth*, it is nothing besides his *Essence* which is so called: For there is nothing in *rerum natura*, but *God* and the *Creature*, and the *Creature's Actions*: And *Aureolus*, that stiffly argueth that *God's Creating Action* is neither *God* nor the *Creature*, but a middle thing, doth satisfie no mans *Understanding*, and is commonly rejected: and he can mean with *sence* nothing but *God as Agent, vel in hoc modo*; as a *Creature in motion* differeth *modally* from the same *quiescent*: But *God* hath no *Modus* which is not *Himself*, though not an *adequate Conception* of himself. You must not conceive of *God* as of a *Creature*, which first by self-motion altereth it self (or is moved by another) and then moveth another thing: But *God diversifieth things* without *diversity*, and *changeth things* being himself *unchanged*.

§. 8. V. As to the *Controversie*, Whether *God* make and move things only *Volendo* (as *Bradwardine* and many others say) or also *Executive agendo*,

do by *excited Power* : *Quoad rem* both are true ; because *Power* and *Will* in God are really the same. But as to our *Conception* and *Expression*, it is a fuller expression to say that he doth it by *Will* and *Power*, because our *Conception* of *meer Volition* is as of *quid immanens* which doth not efficiently go forth of it self, but *command* in Man the *executive Faculties* ; and so conceiving of God after the manner of men, *Volition* is not an *adequate conception* of his *causing Efflux*, without *Active Power* : But they that conceive of *Volition* as *transient* and *potently efficient*, do mean the same thing, and really differ not from others.

§. 9. VI. God's Will as it is his *Essence* hath really no parts, no division, no change, no priority or posteriority, but perfect *Simplicity* and *Eternity*.

§. 10. VII. God's will as it is *himself* hath no Cause but is the Cause of every Creature : And to ask a Cause of the first Cause is absurd.

§. 11. VIII. All the effects of God's Will and *extra*, have their divers natures, orders and seasons, priority, posteriority or simultaneity, which we may soberly enquire after.

§. 12. IX. God's will, though but one, as related to the objects and effects, may by us be diversly denominated : And so we distinguish of his *Creating will*, and his *Redeeming will*, his will to *Save*, and his will to *Damn*, his will to *save Peter*, and his will to *save John*, and so of all the rest of the Objects. In all which we mean not a Diversity of *Essences* or *Faculties* in God, or *Acts ex parte agentis*, really differing ; but only one and the same Will diversly conceived of and denominated by reason of the diversity of objects or effects to which it is

related, and so by *Connotation* the *Will to self* is thus distinguished.

§. 13. X. This *distinction* and *denomination* of God's will, hath *extrinsick Reasons*, which some call *Causes*, from the various *termini*; as the same Light shining into several Rooms; the diversity being real only *ex parte recipientis*. And so God's Will may be said in this Sence to *begin* and to *end*, to have *diversity*, *priority* and *posteriority* of Acts; which are all to be judged of by the *Order of the Objects*.

§. 14. XI. The great question which the School-wits trouble themselves with, and *Vasquez*, with abundance more, pronounce *unsearchable* and past our reach, is, *What is the Cause that God's Will is terminated thus or thus, on this Object rather than on that?* To which I take the boldness to answer for the ending of that Dispute.

By [*the Reason of Termination*] you must mean either, 1. The Reason of the *Being* of that Object or *Terminus* rather than another: or 2. The reason of the *Relation* of God's Will to that *terminus* rather than another, and so of the *denomination*: or 3. The reason of the *being* of that Act of God so terminated.

1. For the first, the cause of all the effects of God's Will, is *his Will to self*: And so of all the diversities effected.

2. The reason of the *Relation* of God's Will to those effects, and so of the *connotation* and *denomination*, is the *Will* and the *Effect* as from which the relation doth result.

3. And

3. And the *Being* or *Act* of the *Will* thus terminated, is *God's essence*, which hath no *Cause*. And what would you have more?

§. 15. But this satisfieth not Men that still think of God as of themselves, but they go on still and ask, *What is the Cause that God's Will was to make this World or Creature rather than another? or to give the first grace rather to one than to another? that his Will is terminated rather on Peter than Judas in election? &c.* But I must but call you back to consider again distinctly of what was answered before. 1. The Cause of all the effects of *Creation*, &c. is *God's Will*: 2. The cause why his Will is related to that effect *à postérieure* is the position of the effect with God's Will. 3. The cause why God hath such a Will is not to be asked, for God's Will hath no Cause. And if you add, *But what is the cause that, à priore, his Will is thus related and denominated as decreeing this or that?* I say, *A priore*, there is nothing in God's Will but it self, which hath no Cause: we dream of priorities and posteriorities and varieties in him, when we think of the following effects; But when there was nothing but God really to terminate his will, there was no ground for any real relation and relative difference; And to talk of *Relationes rationis* in God himself as to non-existent Creatures, and ask the cause of them, is rash presumption; while we know that there was nothing in God but God, who hath no Cause. And the question respecting nothing but what was eternally in God himself, whatever you will call his Essential Will fore-related to the future Creature, you must needs say, that it had no Cause.

§. 16. But if the question go further, *Why God willeth not other Creatures, or other effects, and so his will is not effectively terminated on such*; it is after to be fullier answered; and now it is enough to say, that *Nothing hath no Cause*.

§. 17. And when we say, that God's will may be denominated as divers, *prior and posterior, and changeable as related to Objects that are such*, this is to be understood only of those acts which are to be denominated by Connotation of what is divers and mutable, *ex parte termini*, still remembring that *ex parte Dei* there is really no diversity or mutation. And therefore such denominations are given of God's will chiefly as related to *existent Objects*, which are his Acts called *Love and Hatred, or Complacency and Displacency*: e. g. we may say that [*God is displeased with Paul or Mannaeth unconverted*] and [*he is pleased with them when converted*] the change being only in them. Yet the same denomination may be used also of God's *purposing Will*. As, e. g. we may say, that [*before Christ's Incarnation, God had this Decree; I will send my Son to be incarnate, and die for Man's redemption.*] But now it is not fit to say that *God hath yet such a Decree*, when the thing decreed is past: nor a Decree that *He will create Adam* and the rest of the World, which is created.

§. 18. But whoever liketh or disliketh any of these modes of Speech, must still remember that Controversies about them, are not about any real change in God, (which all deny) but only about the *connotative and respective denomination* of his Will from the changeable Creature. And while
that

that is confessed, sober men will not be forward to fall out about it.

§. 19. Suffer not the Quærist to confound the three forementioned Sences of [the Will of God,] and you may resolve almost all the ordinary questions about it, as is before intimated, without any more ado. As, e.g. Qu. *Is God's Will resistible?* Ans. 1. God's Will, as it is his *Essence*, cannot come into the Question, as not being *passive*, and so not properly *resistible*. 2. As God's Will is taken for the *objects* and *effects* of his will, many of them are *resistible*: As his *Commands* when they are violated are resisted morally; so one *effect* of God's will, or one *Creature* moved by him naturally, may *resist* another. 3. If the question be only whether the respective *Termination* of God's will, and the *Denomination* of it as thus or thus terminated, can be *resisted*? I answer, 1. Not by any resistance upon the *Essential* will of God so terminated. 2. Not by making God to be *willing* and *not willing* of the same thing in the same respect at the same time; for that is a contradiction; and were to make the same *Object* to be and *not to be* at the same time, *Contra necessitatem existentia*. 3. Not by preventing or destroying any *Object* or *Effect* which God's will so produceth, as that no *Creature* hath power to hinder. 4. But when he will cause one sort of *motion*, and himself cause a greater *contrary motion*, or enable a *free Agent* so to do, this *contrary motion* resisting the other *motion*, which was the effect of God's will, his will is denominated as resisted respectively. The same may be said of *Passive Resistance*.

§. 20. So if the Question be [Whether God have any Conditional Will ?] *Ans.* 1. There is no place for the Question about God's Essential Will in it self. 2. Many Objects of God's will and effects are antecedently conditionals. 1. *Quoad formam*, as his conditional Promises. 2. *Quoad eventum*, as when he suspendeth any Right, or Benefit on a condition to be done by a free Agent; as, *e. g.* [Adam shall live if he sin not, and die, if he sin.] But here Conditionality implieth no uncertainty as to God's Knowledge. 3. Therefore if the Question be only, whether *ab objecto* any Will of God may be relatively or comparatively called Conditional, 1. Remember that the Question is but *de nomine*. 2. The same will of God may be called Conditional, as *quid conditionale* is the Object of it; and also Certain and Absolute, as the same thing is to him certainly future, which yet was in the Order of Causing, conditionally future. But this supposeth the *certo futurum*, to be *quid volitum*; and not Sin, which is *certo futurum* and *non volitum*.

C H A P. IV.

Of G O D's Knowledge.

§. 1. **A**S we must not think of God's Will as having various and mutable internal acts as Man's hath; but as *One Essential Act*, only variously denominated from the relation of extrinsec

trinick Objects ; even so must we think also of his *Knowledg*.

§. 2. God knoweth not by *Reception* of any *Light* or *Species* or *Idea* from the Object without him, but as becometh the perfection of the *Infinite Intellect* and *first cause*; even partly by a *productive act of Intellection*, and partly by *termination* on the Objects known. (N. B.) I am fain all along to use the name of [*Extrinick Objects*] to signifie that the Creature is not God : though it is improper to say that any thing is *extra Deum* : but we want better words.

§. 3. Many of the Church-troubling Disputes about *God's Knowledg*, are raised from that prophane supposition, That God knoweth *cogitando*, by many distinct Cogitations, as Man doth, and by *Idea's* or *received Species* of the Creatures. And on the false Supposition that Man can comprehend God's way of Knowing, or at least hath *formal conceptions* of it, and must speak accordingly. From whence there are such rash Disputes which *Act* is *first*, and which cometh *after*.

§. 4. Most of these Controversies are ended by the right applying the foresaid distinctions to God's *Understanding*, which I before applied to his *Will*. As, e. g. Qu. *Hath Gods Knowledg any Cause?* Ans. 1. Not as it is his *Essence*. 2. The Objects of it have their *Causes*. 3. The *denomination* of his Knowledg *as such*, from the Objects respectively, hath its *cause*, such as a *Terminus* may be called. And as in Man the Object is really the *quasi materiale* and *constitutive cause* of the *Act*, not as an *Act*, but as this *Act* in *specie* vel *individuo* thus terminated; so as to the meer *connota-*

tion and relation and denomination, though not as to any real reception, we may speak of God.

§. 5. So if the question be, *Whether God's Knowledge have many Acts?* and *whether one be before or after others?* *Ans.* 1. God's *Essential Knowledge* is simply one. 2. The *Objects* of it are many. 3. Therefore as *denominated ab extra*, from respect to the *Objects*, we may distinguish his simple Knowledge, and mention *priority* and *posteriority*, but such only as resulteth from the *Order of Objects*: And these being but *Conceptions* and *Denominations* necessitated by our *weakness*, without any real diversity in God, we must fear and abhor presumptuous boldness, and contentiousness hereabout.

§. 6. So if the question be, *Whether God's Knowledge be mutable?* *Ans.* 1. His Knowledge *essential* it self is not. 2. The *Objects* are. 3. And therefore the *Denominations* of his Knowledge *ab extra* oft are: As we may say, That God knew from *Eternity* that the *World* would be created, and *Christ* incarnate, as future. But now he knoweth that they were so, *ut praterita*. God doth not now know, that *Christ* will be born, that *Christ* just now is crucified, that *Paul* is preaching on *Earth*: but once he knew all these. Yet here all the Change is in the *object*, and none in God's Knowledge, as there is on mans.

§. 7. If the question be, *How God knoweth future contingents?* *Ans.* 1. God's *Essence* is Knowledge, and is *Infinite*, and therefore extendeth to all that is intelligible: And if they be not *objects* intelligible, it belongeth not to a perfect Intellect to know them. But if they are, it is rashness to ask any other reason of God's knowing them, besides his *Perfection* and their *Intelligibility*: But all Con-

tingents that are *future*, are *Certainties* to God as well as *Contingencies*, in several respects, and accordingly known: But the shallow Brain of Worms doth little know what *Futurity* signifieth in *Eternity* to God. 2. But we know what *future Contingents* are to us. 3. And thence we know that God's Intellect may be denominated by imperfect Man, as in its perfection comprehending our *Futurities* and *Contingencies*; and human Measures, tho' not as Measures to God.

§. 8. If the question be, *Whether God know things as future, because he willeth them to be future; or because they are future from the free Agent's Will?*

Ans. 1. God's Knowledge, *ex parte sui*, is his Essence, and hath no Cause, for it is no Effect. God's *Understanding*, *Will* and *Power* are essentially *One*, but as various, inadequate conceptions, they only make up perfect Unity, and are not Causes and Effects to one another; much less caused by any Creature. 2. But *Futurity* is caused by that which causeth the *thing future*: And therefore the *futurity of Sin* is caused by Man that causeth *Sin*, so far as it is capable of a Cause; of which more in due place: But as *Futurity* is not *Existence*, so it needeth not an *existent*, but sometimes only a *future cause*. 3. And God's Intellect is terminated on things as *Intelligible*, and that is as they are: And so on things that are *future by his own will*, as such; and on things future by *Man's Will*, as such; as far as *Futurity* is an object of an eternal mind.

§. 9. The many Disputes *de scientia simplicis intelligentia, pura visionis & media*, I think best abbreviated according to the forementioned Principles. God's essential *Understanding* is but *One*: *Things*

intelligible are many ; God's *simple Intellect* may be variously denominated as related to and terminated on various intelligible Objects, and so according to *their Order* : But this signifieth no real diversity at all in God, but in the things known : Nor must we dream, that *Scientia simplicis intelligentie*, is like *man's*, a knowledge of certain *Logical Notions* or *Propositions* by way of *Thinking*, as to know that [*This is possible, and the other is possible, and that is convenient.*] as if God needed such *second notions* to know by ; but it is infinitely above Man's mode of knowing : His Knowledge is first *effective* and then *intuitive*, and this without diversity or change in God.

§. 10. It is a great aggravation of the Presumption and Prophaneness of many voluminous School-Disputes, about the unsearchable nature of divine Intellection, that the certain Knowledge of our own great ignorance (even about every silly Creature) and of God's incomprehensibleness and infinite distance, do not prevail to repress such audaciousness, and bring men to more Modesty and Reverence of God : And how much more learnedly and wisely doth he answer abundance of their Questions, who saith [*I know not*] than they that by presumptuous conclusions take on them to know what they do not, nor ever will do, in this World ?

C H A P. V.

OF ELECTION.

§. 1. **ELECTION** in Scripture sometimes signifieth God's actual *choosing* or *taking* one *Man* or *People* from among others to himself, either for his special *Complacency* and *Service* by *Sanctification* or *Conversion*; or to some special *Office*, as *David* was chosen from among his *Brethren*. And sometimes it signifieth God's *eternal Will* or *Decree* so to choose, call or sanctifie and save men at a determinate time: as in *Eph. 1.* and elsewhere.

§. 2. God will convert, justifie, adopt and save some men, by his Grace.

§. 3. Therefore it is certain that God from Eternity did will or decree so to do: For the event in time, maketh it fit so to denominate God's eternal will: Though there was nothing before the Creation really but God; and so real existent Man was not the Object of his Will; and Man in esse cognito, was nothing but God himself, there being nothing else from Eternity (except as Eternity comprehendeth Time.)

§. 4. In the same manner as God bringeth men to Grace and Glory, he willeth or decreeth to do it: For his Decree to do it, is no real Act of God distinct from his Essence; but it is his simple essential will denominated from the effect related to it. Therefore the Controversies about Election

are

are resolved into those about the giving of *Grace* and *Salvation*; and there will be clearer opened.

§. 5. Glorification, Perseverance, Adoption, Justification, Sanctification, Faith and Repentance (or Vocation) preparatory common Grace, and the Gospel, and other means of Conversion, are several Gifts of God's Grace through Christ: Therefore God's Decrees to give them may be diversly denominated from relation to the effect. The Decree to glorifie may be distinguished from the Decree to convert, to justifie, &c. And yet where all these are really conjoined, and are but (as the parts of one Engine) the several gifts which make up *One Salvation*, as the object or effect is in that sence *One*, so may God's Decree be called *One*, as related to it. So that they that say God's Decrees about our *Salvation* are many, and they that say *They are one*, do both speak Truth, and disagree not.

§. 6. They that will denominate God's *Volitions* or *Decrees* according to the *Order of Intention*, must not mean that *Ex parte Volentis*, God hath really many thoughts, *Volitions* or *Decrees*, and that the first is *de fine*, and the next *de mediis*. But only that in the order of *real Causation*, one of God's Gifts or Effects is made to be a *Cause* or *Means* to the production or attainment of another; and so the latter is to be *Man's End* intended in the use of the former; and so *Man* is first to intend the *End* before he useth the *Means*: But no Gift, Work or Creature is to be called *God's End*, except when we speak Vulgarly after the manner of Men, that which we will not defend as proper Speech.

§ 7. Yet God may be said to *will* and *make* One thing to produce or *Cause* another; which importeth only that it is a *second Efficient Cause* of that Other, and the other an *intended Effect*; and also that the other is to *man* to have *rationem finis*, and so may be called *finis operis*, & *operantis secundarii*.

§ 8. God is not an *Efficient Cause* of *Himself*, or any thing in *Himself*, and therefore not properly an *End* to *Himself*, because there is nothing in *Him* Caused. But if any will speak otherwise, as if there were in God himself *Eternal Causation Efficient and final*, and *Eternal Effects*, and thereby explain the Doctrine of the *Trinity*, let them remember that they venture on singular Expressions, and such as favor of Imperfection; but we hope that they differ from the Commoner way, but in a *Logical Notion*, rather than in a *real Conception*.

§ 9. If we may not say that *God is his own End* (for every *End* hath a *Means*, and there is no *Means* to *God's Beings* or *Perfections*) then he is not properly said to have *any End*. For nothing but *Himself* can properly be his *End*.

§ 10. Yet when by an *End* we mean but improperly the ultimate *Effect*, and not any thing which to *God* is *Causa agendi*; and so declare that we take the words *End* and *Intention* equivocally as to *God* and *Man*, the phrase may be used: And in that sence we must say that *God's will* as *Efficient* being the *Beginning* of all things, *God's will* as *fulfilled and pleased* is the *End* of all; which yet signifieth not any *diversity* or *change* in *God*; for his *Will* is *always fulfilled*, though not always by the

the same means : And the fulfilling of his will must be our ultimate proper End.

§. 11. And because that the excellency of God's works is his own Image or Glory shining in them, and the Perfection of the whole Universe most fully containeth that Glory, therefore we may say that God's Glory is his End, and that as it is found in the perfection of the Universe, of which the Glorified Church is an eminent part.

§. 12. Therefore they that call the Glorifying of God's Mercy in Saving, and of his Justice in Damning men, his End, and all that tendeth here-to the Means, do name a means, (and that not the highest) as the End : For the Glory of Mercy and justice is but part of God's created or caused Glory, and especially as it is on this or that Individual : But the perfection of Christ, Angels, Saints, Heaven, Earth, and all things, is that Glory which may be called materially God's End, as being his perfectest Effect ; as the Complacency or fulfilling of his will, herein is the most formal notion of it. But God's Glory appeareth in every Creature and every providential change, in its proportion ; and if any will call that God's End, we must not make a strife of words if we mean the same thing.

§. 13. According to this explained sence of Intention, the distributing of God's Decrees *juxta ordinem intentionis*, will make no considerable Controversie ; but in the distribution of them *juxta ordinem Executionis*, we more commonly and easily agree : And it being but the divers denominations of God's simple will from the effects, it is from the Effects sure that they are fitly distinguished.

§ 14. As to the controversies about the *Objects of God's Decrees*, meaning the *Personal or subjective Object* as distinct from the effects of the Volition (or the presupposed State of him that God Decreeeth the gift to.) If we will distribute God's Decrees or Volitions as the parts or gifts decreed are distributed, then the question is all one, as, *What State a man is supposed to be in when God gives him such or such a Gift*; which is a thing that we are not much disagreed about.

§. 15. e. g. The *Recipient of the Gift of Glory* is a *persevering faithful Saint*. The *Receiver of the Gift of Perseverance* is a *true Believing Saint*: The *Gift of Justification, Adoption, and the Spirit of further Sanctification*, is given to a *penitent Believer*: *Faith and Repentance* are given usually to persons prepared by a *more common Grace*, having the means of Grace, and for ought we know sometimes suddenly without such Preparation. And so on to the beginning.

C H A P. VI.

Of Reprobation, or the Decree of Damnation.

§. 1. **T**HOUGH ἀδόκιμος in Scripture signifieth one whose existent Pravity rendereth him *disapproved, loathed and rejected of God*, yet we here continue the word *Reprobation* as ordinarily used, for the Decree of rejecting men for ever, that

that we may be understood ; not refusing any fitter name.

§. 2. God's *essential Will as such* is not called *Reprobation* nor a Decree of Damnation, as distinct from other Volitions : Therefore the distinguishing denomination must be fetcht from the effects or objects which it hath relation to.

§. 3. Therefore where there is no effect or object of God's Will, there is no such will to be named and asserted : But so much as God effecteth in or towards Mans damnation, so much he must be said to will.

§. 4. God effecteth no mans Sin, and therefore he willed not or decreed not to effect it.

§. 5. He effecteth it not either for it self, or as a means to something better : Therefore he decreed not to do either.

§. 6. God effecteth *much* without which Sin could not be, (as the Life and Power of the Sinners, his abused Mercies, Objects, &c.) Therefore all this he decreed to do, even as his own Works, which Sinners make the occasions of their Sin.

§. 7. If it be said that God *permitteth Sin* ; therefore he decreed to permit it : These things must be answered. 1. *Permission* is an ambiguous word : Strictly it signifieth in Physicks nothing at all but a *meer Negation*, which is *non impedit*, not to hinder : But in *Politicks* it oft signifieth a *positive Licence* or *voluntary Concession* of *Leave* for a man to do or possess something : And many Divines by *Permission* mean not bare *non-impedit*, but also some action that tendeth to the procuring of the event. In the first and proper sence, it followeth not that God *decreed to permit Sin*, because he *permitteth* it : For *permitting* here is but a bare verb,

verb, and signifieth *nothing* : *Not-to-hinder* is meerly *nothing* : And *nothing* is no *terminus* to denominate Gods Decree or Will. But as permitting signifieth any positive act, which men make an *occasion* of Sin, it is improperly called *Permission*, and it was spoken of before : And though God's *general Influx* be *presupposed*, that is not *Permission*, nor part of *Permission*.

And as *Permission* signifieth *Leave* to Sin, God permitteth none ; for it is not Sin if *so permitted*.

2. And if it would hold that God *Decreeth* his *Permission* of Sin, it followeth not that he decreeth the Sin *permitted* ; for that is not a capable object of his Volition.

§. 8. God effecteth *punishment*, even in Hell (at least, part of it, of which in due place) therefore he decreeth or willeth so to effect it.

§. 9. God damneth none but *Sinners* : Therefore he decreed to damn none but Sinners : Therefore a Man only as a Sinner is the object of the Decree of Damnation or Punishment, seeing the Decree is denominated from the effect.

§. 10. It is not a Sinner meerly as a Sinner that God will damn : else all Sinners should be damned. But it is only a certain sort of *Sinners*, who *prevalently and finally reject remedying means and mercy*. Therefore it is only such that are the Objects of the particular Decree of Damnation.

§. 11. In the first instant we are *Men*, in the second *innocent*, in the third *guilty of Sin* against the meer Law of *Innocency* ; in the fourth we are brought under the *Law of Grace* upon the Promise of a *Redeemer*, and in the fifth we have the *Common Mercies* of that *Law* and *Redemption* given us,

as means to our performance of the Duty which that Law requireth and obtaining further Mercy. In none of these instants is a man the object of the Decree of Damnation: God damneth not any man meerly as a *Man*, or as *Innocent*, or as a *Sinner* against the meer Law of Innocency, nor as redeemed and under the Law of Grace, nor as receiving the common means and mercies of that Covenant; Nay, nor as in the sixth Instant he is guilty of sinning against such Mercies; (for else all that do so should perish.) But only as in the seventh instant he is found a prevalent, final rejecter of the special Grace, and abuser of the common Mercies of that Covenant. And therefore the Decree is to be accordingly denominated; though God's essential will have no Cause, nor Dependance upon any Creature.

§. 12. But there are other Acts of God's justice which are comprized in *Reprobation* or *Rejection* as the word is commonly understood: As, 1. Cutting off a sinner untimely in his Impenitency. 2. Denying him some inward helps of Grace which once he had, or was fair for (so far as that is *quid positivum*) and depriving him positively of some Means of Grace; for his sinful refusal or abuse, or for abuse of other Means and Mercies. And all these punishments God so far decreeth as he *Executeth*; which is upon none but such as by sin against the Law of Grace deserve them.

§. 13. But where *Negations* are no *Punishments* nor *Privations*, they fall not under the notion of *Positive Effects* or *Objects*, and so are not fit to denominate a *Positive Decree* or *Will*. Therefore when it is not a Punishment, (Not to give Faith, Repentance, Preaching, &c.) is no act of *Reprobation*:

bation: As not to give that Faith, Repentance and Pardon which he needed not to Adam in Innocency; not to give them in act to Infants, &c.

§. 14. Yea, when a Penal Privation is only the consequent of God's not Acting, and not of any Positive Act, there the Ratio Poenae is of God, and is *quid positivum*, and God causeth it by that Law which did make the *debitum poenae*: But yet the Negation or Privation in which it consisteth is Nothing, or nothing of God's causing, and therefore not fit to denominate a distinct Decree: e. g. Not to give special Grace, Pardon, Justification, Glory, to Judas, is nothing, and so as nothing not the object of a positive Decree: But both the positive acts by which any Mercy is withdrawn, and also the relation of Punishment which is in these Nothings or Privations is caused by God, and therefore Decreed by him. As if God say, *This shall be his punishment that will not Eat, that he shall die of Famine*: Here not eating is nothing, but the penal reason which is in Famine, which is but the privation of Meats, resulteth from the Law of Nature and will of God.

§. 15. By all this it appeareth that Election and Reprobation go not *pari passu*, or are not equally ascribed to God. For in Election God is the Cause of the means of Salvation by his Grace, and of all that truly tendeth to procure it: But on the other side, God is no cause of any sin which is the means and merit of Damnation; nor the Cause of Damnation, but on the supposition of Man's sin: So that sin is foreseen in the Person Decree'd to Damnation, (but not Caused) seeing the Decree must be denominated from the Effect and Object: But in Election God decreeth to give

us his *Grace*, and be the *chief Cause* of all our Holiness, and doth not elect us to Salvation on foresight, that we will do his Will or be Sanctified by our selves without him. Therefore *Augustin*, *Prosper* and *Fulgentius*, still make this difference, That the decree of Damnation goeth on foresight of sin, but the Decree of Salvation containeth a Decree to give that Grace that shall certainly Save us.

An

An A N S W E R T O

Mr. Polehill's Exceptions about Futurition.

S I R,

I Am much chidden already for writing many Books, and Answering so many that object, and am told, That if the Case well Stated will not satisfie men, no Answer will do it, because it is for want of their Receptive Capacity, which long and right Studies must help them to, and not a meer Answer to their Objections. I very highly value the worthy Gentleman whose Papers you sent me, hearing of few, if any, among us more commended for Knowledge and Piety. The question is but whether it be he or I that by half confused conceptions of the matters in question speaketh in the Dark, or which of us hath the more ripe digested and ordered thoughts hereof. And must others be troubled with such Cases? It is those that he pleadeth for that have made the edge of the Razor so thin that they or I do Cut our Fingers with it, and have spun such subtile Notions, which if their wits when they have done be not subtile enough to manage, they will oft slip through or be as Spiders Webs. As to the first Controversie of Futurity or Possibility, this Gentleman's method will do me no good, being no whit fitted to that which I expect. I should expect from him that he had taken

taken notice of my Distinctions and Explications of Futurity, and that he had directly pleaded only for that sort or sence which I deny, and had Answer'd the Reasons which both in the First and Second Part I bring against it. But it is not so: And to Dispute at such rates is but to try who shall live longest to have the last word, (it being easie at this rate to talk against one another as long as we live) which I cannot expect, and therefore shall give any man herein the best. All that he hath said against me is materially Answered in the Book already, and if he perceive it not, how can I help that? More Books are not like to do it, nor have I leisure for such tasks: Yet briefly I return,

I. As to my sence of the words (Future) and (Possible); 1. As they are predicated of the thing *future* or *possible*, they are *termini diminuentes quod realitatem existentem*, and *futurity* as it is *rei ipsius futuritio* is nothing. 2. Whether Time be any thing distinct à *re durante* or Nothing, is a Controversiè, which I conjecture Mr. P — 's Pen and mine are never like to decide. It is enough for me now to say, that I take it for nothing Distinct. 3. Yet shallow man that seeth not *uno intuitu* the Universe, as God doth, nor hath his essential Eternity, is in motion, where there is *mensura motus*, and must think of things by partial Conceptions, and must make *past*, *present*, and *future* his differing Notions in Duration. 4. The internal *Conceptus* in man of a thing as *future* (that it will be) is *quid reale*; for it is an act of the mind and a *Verbum mentis*; and an act *de nihilo*: A mental Negation is a real act:

To

To think and say in the mind (the World was not from Eternity: Darkness, Death, &c. are nothing) are real thoughts. 5. The *verbum prolatum ore vel scripto* (sin will be, &c. the Sun will rise, &c.) is *quid reale* : It is a Word, a Proposition. 6. The *fundamentum* or premises, from which such a Conclusion may be fetch'd, is *quid reale* : e. g. God's Will or Knowledge, or any necessitating Cause. 7. God that knoweth man, knoweth all his mental Conceptions and his Propositions *de futuro*, without Imperfection knowing our Imperfection; and so knoweth whether they are true or false. 8. God's willing and knowing that things were, are or will be, are all one *ex parte Dei*, being nothing but his simple, perfect Essence thus knowing and willing: But *ex parte rei cognita aut volita*, there is difference; And thence by Relation, Connotation, or extrinseck denomination, God's internal Acts are variously named, as *de praterito*, *de presenti*, *de futuro*. 9. God's Will and Knowledge from Eternity, that there shall be Time, Successions, Man, Propositions, and that things shall be in such an Order, are a foundation of the verity of such a *verbum mentis vel oris* (these will be) if there had been any such eternal Words or Propositions. 10. Though *formaliter* there was no such thing in God (& *forma denominat*); yet *eminenter* that perfect intuition of God, which is the knowledge of all Intelligibles, comprehendeth all of man's Knowledge, which is any part of Perfection: And we must bear with the naming of God's perfect Acts by the same names that signifie our imperfect Acts; so be it we have due care not to ascribe to him the Imperfection;

nor from names which connote Imperfection in *sensu primo*, to infer false Doctrinal Conclusions of God. 11. An *ipsum nihilum* may receive in man's partial Conception, a name, and accordingly many and divers names fetch'd from some reasons of his Conceptions. 12. Accordingly we call a thing that is really nothing, but as in the Cogitation to be *possible*, or *future*, or *past*, as if these were *rerum reales affectiones*, or somewhat now Real: Whereas the Epithets are but the modes of our own Notions or Thoughts, and raised from our knowledge of other things. And the proper Language is but this, (God can do this: God will do this) which suppose it not done. As (God can make the world) would have been a true word from Eternity, had there been any such word to be true. And thence we say (The World was possible.) And God's perfect Knowledge being *eminenter* somewhat infinitely more perfect than such Thoughts, Words, and Propositions, after the manner of weak man, we speak of *God* and of *Nothings* as related to his Will that they shall be, or to his Knowledge, and so call them *possible* and *future*.

II. Now I expect the Confutation of the Reasons, which I gave (As that there was nothing Eternal but God, therefore Eternal *possibility* and *futurity* can be nothing but Conception of God himself; and so of the rest.)

III. His Exceptions have all their strength from the meer ambiguity of the word (*futurity*), continuing the Confusion after all my Explication. I have not time to Transcribe all his words, and therefore must suppose you to have his Writing by you, which I shall briefly Answer in Order.

Ad 1. As *nothing* they differ not, but man's various Conceptions of them differ, as do the Reasons of those Conceptions and Denominations: *Sun* and *Moon*, *Angels* and *Men*, were equally *nothing* from Eternity: And yet God's simple Will to make all these, might have had various relative or extrinſick Denominations, had there been then a Created Intellect ſo to name it, and theſe *nothings* called *Future*, *Angels*, *Men*, &c. accordingly.

Ad 2. *Nothing* as *nothing* hath no Parts or Diſtinctions, but *nothing* may be variously named; or to ſpeak more aptly, Before Things are Any-things a purpoſing and fore-ſeeing Agent may make Names and Notions for them before the things. *Greg. Ariminæ* copiouſly diſputeth that (that which is not, may be related to that which is, and that which is, to that which is not, or *nothing*): his Reasons are ſubtile. Relation is *rerum referabilitas* or *Comparabilitas*. If an Angel Exiſted before the Light or Sun, and knew that God would make the Light or Sun, why might not the Angels Intellect refer God's Will to the Light or Sun, which he would make, while it was *nothing*? Which is no more than to know (that God will make ſuch a thing which is yet *nothing*.) But I ſay theſe *nothings* relate not to God, but God's Power, Knowledge and Will, may by an Intelligent Creature be conſidered (while they are not) as that which will make them, doth foreſee them, &c. which is to be referred to them. It's true that *nothing* is no effect, and will be nothing without God (which is that I ſaid). It's true that the Divine Power doth not make meer Poſſibility to be any thing, for it is
nothing.

nothing : But it being true that God can make that which he yet hath not made, for this proper Speech (God can make it) man's broken thoughts put a Name or Epithete on that which *is not*, and call it *possible* for Discourse sake, and for the ordering of our thoughts about *nothings*, or things that yet are not (yea never will be): For we say that Millions of Millions of *non futura* are possible. And is Possibility then any thing *extra mentem Divinam & humanam*? Why he spake of things being *possible* without the Divine Power I know not. I take Possibility as real to be but part of that *Ens rationis* or mental Conception which by Reasoning we take up of *Non-existents*, because God can make them that yet are not made. The same I say of his words (if *futures* be *futures* without the Divine will, what horrible Fate must be upon God?) *Futures* are nothing, and no good will ever be but by God's Will. And because he willeth it, we have the just ground of a Conclusion that it will be (if we know it). And this thought or word is therefore true, and had we been from Eternity, and had such a thought, it would have been true. And while there was no Sun or Earth, we should have said, They are *futures*, that is, they will be; that is, God will make them: And must *futurity* therefore be a Thing or Being? Whence then came the supposition of Fate, imposing on the *summum Ens*, or what meaneth it?

Ad 3. Nothing indeed hath no Verity: *Futures* are not true; but *Conceptus* or Propositions, that such things will be, are true. How God's perfect Knowledge is extrinsically denominated the Knowledge that such things will be (which we

call *Futurition*) I opened in the Book at large. You know, I suppose, how commonly it is said, That *Nothings* and *Impossibles* and *Non-futurities* are all known to God : Must therefore *Nothing*, *Impossibility*, and *Non-futurity* be Beings, lest God cannot know them ? God cannot know things to be *future* you say, unless they are such : The words (*are such*) sound to the ignorant, as if they signified Entity. God cannot know *Nothings* to be *Nothing*, *Impossibilities*, *Non-futurities*, unless they are such ; that is, unless it be true that they are such : And it is true. But what is it that's true ? The *verbum mentis vel oris*, that they are nothing, &c. Must they therefore needs be something, and so God be mistaken ? But he saith (*If there be no eternal Futures, what becometh of Divine Prescience ?*) Good mens Thoughts may wrong God, while they think they honour him. *Augustine* tells you, That Prescience differeth not in God from Science of present things. You may say also, If there be no eternal *Nothings*, *Non-futures*, how can God know them ? But must *Futurity*, or *Non-futurity*, or *Nothing*, be therefore any thing ? God's knowing that it *will be* and yet *is not*, proveth that the thing *future* is *nothing* ; and therefore *Futurity*, no *modus rei*, but a Name put by us on *Nothing* from God's Will to make it. (Supposing it be not Sin, which God will not make, but hath another Cause.) I had thought you had known, how commonly the School-men prove, That things that are not may be certainly known by God ; yea, how the Nominals prove his Knowledge of future Contingents from his meer Perfection ; so that *Socinus* is not unanswered in those things, and yet *Futures* and *Futurity* are no beings. At least, you may

may see Answer enough in *Serangius* and *Le Blank* (two Authors well worth your reading.) Those things are *certo futura*, which God will certainly make, or certainly knoweth will be done; and yet *Futurity* be *nihil reale*. I would you had told me, whether you take the Reality of *Futurity* to be *in esse rei extrinseca*, or *in esse objectivo intrinseco*? The former you are not able (considerately) to believe; (that nothing can have any real mode, accident, or affection;) if none of these, what is it then? You must needs hold to the latter; and then in man, the *futurity* of things is nothing real, but the mode of his Cogitation or Conception; as I have afore said, we may have real thoughts, that here is not such or such a thing, but will be; in which we frame a real *Idea* of that which will be (and is not) in our minds (from the helps of similitudes or words) and so say, Such a thing (thought on and named, but not in being) will be. But in God there is nothing but God; the Creature is of him, and is in him dependently as their Cause and Comprehender, but not as constituent of his immanent acts.

Why you add (*Suppose nothing to have some Verity*) is above my reach: I think *Nothing* hath no *Verity*: But, 1. God's Knowledge that it will be, hath *Verity*. 2. The Proposition (*This will be*) may have *Verity*. 3. But the thing future hath no *Veritas rei*. *Futurity* as *in re* hath no more Entity than Possibility: But to will or know that *quid nominatum* can be, and that it will be, are two real acts in Man, and two extrinseck Denominations of the Divine Will and Intellect. When you have answered what I said of Dr. *Twisse*, I may review it.

Ad 4. You say (*Future is nothing; ergo, Nothing is future.*) I am glad that the Creed and Bible are not thus worded: *Future* in your first Proposition signifieth the Affection or somewhat real of the thing future, and so it is nothing; if you take *future* so in the second, it is *frivole* but true, being but a gross expression of (*Nothing hath real Futurity, which is aliquid rei.*) But according to common use, your second Proposition will be taken for a denial of the Saying (*Something will be*) and this is a real truth. You say the Proposition is identical, as (*Nothing is Nothing.*) We speak not of the Being or truth of Propositions or Conceptions, but of *futurity* it self as *in-complexum*. You after confess I told you so. May you not equally say (*Negations, Non-existent, Non-futurity* are nothing; *ergo* Nothing is a *Negation, Non-existent, Non-future?*) Answer one and you answer the other. *Negations in mente* are Thoughts, and in the Mouth they are Words, but in *re negata* they are nothing: So I say of *Non-futurity* and *Non-existence*. Frail Man dreameth that the *mundus naturalis* is the same with the *mundus fantasticus & notionalis* in his Brain; and Oh! how commonly do Words and Thoughts go in Disputes for Extrinsic Realities?

Ad 5. Because God decreeth to do any thing, you and I, when we know it, may truly say (*This will be;*) and (*will be*) is no being, but Gods will and our knowledg and our words are. Alas, that so much skill is necessary not to be deceived by ambiguity of words. God's Knowledg and your Knowledge and your Words, may be all true; and yet *Futurity ex parte rei futura*, hath no proper Verity, metaphysical, physical or moral, being no
sub.

subject capable of any such. You say [*Did not the Futurity of the World result from a Decree?*] It's wearisome at every Sentence to repeat Distinction and open Confusion. The futurity of the World is nothing, *Extra mentem Divinam & humanam, & extra propositionem de futurismo.* Why talk you of our designing another Origin, when we are proving, that it's nothing, and needs no Cause? And why answer you not what I wrote against Dr. Twisse, before you call for an Answer to him? Or at least, why answer you not Strangius, but impertinently talk of the Serpent Socinus? If Socinus had no more wit than to take the Futurity of Sin for a Being, (Substance, Accident or Mode) no wonder if he knew not how to deny that God is the Cause of it. And why do you not attempt to answer me, who tell you, That if you take it to be a real Being and eternal, you must take it to be God himself; for nothing else is eternal. But I pray you say not (like your former arguing about nothing) [*The eternal Futurity of Sin is God himself; ergo, God is the eternal Futurity of Sin.*] The Subject and Predicate are not so convertible as you seem to make them. You say, if we say, Futurity is nothing, then it is a wonder, an independent on God and his Will, self-originated and unpreventable, &c. You write no wonders to me, this rate of Discourse being common in the World, and hath been in most Ages. Is Nothing a wonder? Is it a wonder for nothing to be independent? but yet that which hath no dependent Being, may so far as a Nothing be at God's will, that he continue nothing or make something (the first *non agendo*, the second *agendo*) as he pleases, that is, by willing or not willing. And it were a wonder indeed for

Nothing to be self-originated, or that Nothing should spring from any thing as an efficient Cause: But reductively some Nothings may be ascribed to God's Non-agency, as Beings good are to his action. As God is improperly called the Cause of Darkness, because he there maketh not Light, so improperly he may be said to be the Cause of Nothings, because he made not the contrary Some-
 things. You say (then there is *fatum Stoicissimum* on God) and all his Works, and this Futurity binds the Almighty, that he cannot do as he pleaseth in Heaven and Earth. This is a wonder indeed that Nothing should be stronger than God, and rule him and the World. If Dr. Twisse hold Sin to be nothing, doth it follow, that it binds God, because it's nothing? Doth Death bind God, because it is but the privation of Life; or vacuity (*si detur vacuum*) because it is nothing? Or when there was nothing but God, did Nothingness bind God? Is that God bound or conquer'd that can turn Nothing into Something at his pleasure? *Non-futurity* is nothing: therefore it hath no Cause. Is this Nothing the Ruler of God and All things, because he causeth not that which is not causable? Alas, that good men should keep up dividing Controversies at this rate of reasoning: You say, If it have no Cause, it can have no Impediment, and so there is *Fatum Stoicissimum*. We all talk at the rate that we understand. The World was nothing before it was made, and so had then no Cause in the *esse causa*, as being no effect (Relations in *esse* being simultaneous): Doth it follow that God was subject to Fate? There was no Impediment indeed to Nothingness; it is not necessary that Nothing be hindred, lest it become
 Some-

Something. God can make somewhat where there is nothing, at his pleasure, and can make a future Nothing to become an existent Something. And what should be the *medium* I wonder that tempted you to think otherwise: Did the nothingness of Angels before their Creation hinder God from making them? Or can nothing have a ruling Power?

Id 6. Again you stick not at the repeating of the contradiction of a self-originated Future (or Nothing) and think God's Decrees endangered by nothing, because it hath no Cause. What a dreadful thing is this Nothing! To be self-originated is to be Something of it self. And if *Futurity* be nothing, then it is something of it self. And you offer not a Syllable to prove these Contradictions. You add (*To what purpose shall Decrees be?*)

Ans. To produce the thing decreed in its proper time and place, and not to make them something before they are any thing, nor to make an *Ens Rationis* to be a real extrinseck Entity. You strangely say (*To decree such a Futurity is a nullity, for it can never come to pass.*) What can never come to pass? *Futurity*? Say also (*To decree Non-futurity, or that there shall be to us but one Sun, but one Saviour, is a nullity, because Nothing can never come to pass.*) What is it for Nothing to come to pass? It is come to pass without a Cause that there is but one Sun to us, but one Saviour, and other Nothings. The Decree or Will of what shall come to pass is no nullity: for it shall all come to pass; and yet the Decree made not the word (*shall be*) to signifie a real Entity, distinct form or model of the thing that shall be. The Decree that there shall be a World, was fulfilled, and

and yet (*shall be*) was not a being before the World, unless it was God's Essence. Your Phrase importeth as if *Futurity* must come to pass as a thing Decreed, and question whether there was a *futurity* of that *futurity*, and so in *infinitum*. For the word (*Coming to pass*) importeth *futurity* of *futurity*, and not *eternity*. You say [*To decree in compliance with it, is below God over All---for it will come to pass whether God decree it or no.*] Alas, that Speaking should be so hard an Art ! What is it to decree in compliance with nothing ? Hath it any sense ? How is it that Nothing will come to pass ? It's true, that Nothing will be Nothing without a Cause, and therefore without a Decree. And therefore let the reverence of God make you consider, whether it be meet for us in the dark to ascribe to God such Decrees of nothing, and to number Nothings, and make as many Decrees. Such a dance and game of notions we may more boldly use about our selves than about God, till we know him better. You add (*God in decreeing doth not decree the thing into being in the instant of decreeing, but He decreeth the Futurity of it, and if that be nothing, he decreeth nothing.*) *Ans.* Wrong thoughts will have wrong words. All that you should have inferred, is, [That His Decree effecteth nothing till the time come] which is true : For He decreed only to effect it at such a time : But doth it follow, that God decreeth nothing but *Futurity*, because the thing decreed is not presently done ? Thus you must say, That God decreed not the World, nor CHRIST, nor Salvation, but *Futurity* only. The Decree or Will of God was, That the World, CHRIST, Resurrection, &c. shall be at such a time : (*shall be*) is no being ; and yet

yet it is a *being* when existent, which God decreed, but his Decree maketh it not a *being* till it exist. Dr. Twisse will over and over tell you, that God's immanent acts do *nihil ponere in objecto*. And I have oft told you truly, that you or I little know what we say when we divide God's Eternity into parts, and assign him his *præteritum & futurum*. And it would put you hard to it to tell me clearly and surely what God's Eternal Decree is before the effect exist! our present common-received School-Divinity will call us Blasphemers, if we say, that before the Creation there was any thing but God, and any thing in God but God, and that God had any real accidents: And therefore it saith, that he doth *operari per essentiam*, and not *per accidentia*. And therefore that God's Decree before the effect was nothing but his Essence. But it is his Essence denominated (not as such, but) as related to the things decreed, though yet they be not. If you will forsake this common Theology, and place acts in God, which *ex parte agentis*, are but Accidents and not his Essence, and say, This is consistent with his Simplicity and Perfection, you will let in a Body of new Divinity, and we shall not know when we have all God's Accidents, nor how to order them. His freest Acts are his Essential Will freely acting; but those free acts themselves before the effect are nothing but God himself. We must not place in God a number of Thoughts, Images, Notions, Accidents, as we do in Man. But your Phrase favoureth of other Thoughts.

Ad 7. Here you are for yea and nay: you will suppose no Propositions in God, and yet you argue that then, what will remain of a Decree. I said,

But

But that God knoweth not by Propositions, but yet that he knoweth Propositions. If you hold, That God knoweth by Propositions and Argumentations, say so, that I may know what to speak to. If you hold, That He hath no Decrees, what is it that you plead for? But to answer your Question, God's Decree is not a forming of Propositions in his mind, or any change in himself, or addition to his Being: But it is His simple will that such and such things shall be, emanative, communicative, productive of them in their season. There are some that think, that as Time-Divisions are the measures of imperfect Creatures, and God's Eternity hath none such; so that it is an ascribing Imperfection to God, to say, That he hath Decrees *de futuris* distinct from a productive Volition, which in the most proper sence should be denominated from the produced Existent as such. But in this I interest not myself, as knowing that we must speak improperly of God or not at all. You say that (*It shall be, is a Futurity.*) *Ans.* What's that? A (*shall be*) is (*a Futurity*), and (*a futurity*) is a (*shall be.*) *Ergo* a *shall be* and a *futurity* is a being. Would I knew what. But to hope for that from you is too great Presumption. You add (*A futurity, a nothing, and to decree nothing is not to decree.*) *Ans.* Say you so? I am glad you say no worse: Then if those be in the right (as most) that think Sin is nothing (no more than Death or Darkness) you will grant that God decreed it not. And if I prove that Futurity *ex parte rei*, is nothing, you will grant that it needeth no Decree as such. But seeing you are so much on my side, I crave your help to confute those, that otherwise you defend, who make innumerable Nothings the Objects

jects of God's Decrees. But yet I would not follow you too far : (*Not to give Grace to an Infidel*) is nothing. (*Not to give the Gospel, not to end the World till the time, not to take away Grace, Gospel, Life, &c.*) You say here (in your general) that none of these can be decreed. But then prepare an Answer to your Friends that will take this ill of you. I have fully opened my sence of it elsewhere. You say (*Abstract futurity from the Decree and it will be nothing.*) *Ans.* If you abstract not Futurity as a real Entity from the Decree, you will abuse God by presumptuous false Conceits : But if you abstract the word *shall be* from the humane *Conceptus* of it, it will not differ from a *Conceptus de presente*. And though I more reverence you, I may say of some other Objecters that quibble with arbitrary notions, that if you except fatuity and Futility, from what they say for the entity of Futurity, it is all nothing. You add (*That if in time only the thing actually exist by virtue of the Decree, the Decree is something in time, but eternally it was nothing.*) That is (*God's will to effect any thing is nothing till it do effect it.*) Yes, 't's God's Will so to do, and is that nothing ? It is nothing but God's essential will denominated from the *res efficienda* ; but that is not nothing : if God be nothing, there is Nothing. There is nothing indeed but God from Eternity. If you think otherwise, tell us what it is. *Aureolus* indeed pleadeth, That *Altus Dei creantis* is neither Creator nor *Creatura*, but *quid medium*, but few second him, and many confute him. It seems you think of Futurity as our *Epicureans*, and our new Infidels do of matter, That it is an eternal effect of God as an eternal Cause. I will give you many thanks if you will peruse and
answer

answer *Raymundus Lullius's* Arguments against the Eternity of any Creature, where he argueth, That whatsoever hath the perfection of Eternity, must needs have other suitable Perfections, and so be God. Is Futurity a more excellent Being than Spirit, Matter and Motion, to be capable of this Divine Attribute? I pray what is the Verity that you say resulteth eternally? Can you forgive me for not loving Confusion? Is it, 1. The *veritas rei futurae*? 2. Or the *veritas conceptus Divini de rerum futuritione*? 3. Or the Verity of a Proposition? Are these all one with you? The first being a Metaphysical Verity, is *Affectio entis*, as *unum* and *bonum* are: And *quod non est, non est unum, verum aut bonum*. 2. As to the third, is it a divine Proposition, or a humane? If a divine, prove that God had either *conceptus vel prolatas*, eternal Propositions; if he had and you prove it, I never denied the truth of such propositions. If humane, when there was no man, there was no humane propositions. All that you can say is but what I oft said, That God's Volitions were a ground that would have made such propositions (*These things will be*) certainly true, if there had been any such eternal propositions. And as to the second, it is not denied as before explained. God's Will and Knowledge were certain, but they were but himself, who gave no Being to eternal Futurition out of himself. You ask (*How are the Promises, being Propositions, true signs of the Divine Will, where there are none?*) *Ans.* How is the World and *signa naturalia* the signs of God's Will, and how are Writings and Voices signs of it, if there be no World, Writings or Voices in God? God willeth that which is not

in

in himself eternally : God willeth Creatures and God willeth Propositions. And these are the products of his Veracity, when he sendeth them by Revelation : and true, because they come from him. When his Will is to give the world an incarnate Saviour, may not the promise of this truly signifie his will, though he have no Proposition in his mind, but only a will to give him, and an intuitive Knowledge ? But I say again, if you can prove, that God thinketh, reasoneth, or talketh eternally, and knoweth by *terminos simpliciter*, Propositions and Syllogisms, I will easily confess that all these are true, and yet not grant that *ex parte rei*, Futurition or Non-futurition, Possibility or Impossibility are any Beings.

Ad 8. You meet with a distinction of [*Futurity* as nothing, and a Proposition *de futuro* as something.] with an [how so? It signifieth only *futurity*, and that is just nothing.] *Ans.* You should pardon a man in my condition, if he be loth to write new Books to answer all Objectors that know not that a Proposition *de nihilo* is something. If Atheists say, There is no God, They shall know that they say something : If I say that there are no other true Gods, I say something. They that say *Datur vacuum* say something. You say (But was it not true before :) what is your (*it*)? The Proposition was not true before it was a Proposition, *Concepta vel prolata* : Futurity had not the Metaphysical or Physical verity of an Entity ; for it was nothing. The *res futura* had no such truth ; for it was not *res demonstrata tantum*. What mean you then by (*it*)? I say still if you can prove that there was an Eternal Proposition *de futuro* in God, it
was

was true and was God's Essence; which is nothing to our question. You add [Not true before, nor knowable as true.] *Ans.* You seem by this to intimate that God cannot know what will be by his production, without making Mental or Oral Propositions, and knowing them to be true. Must God's Prescience be deplorable, if he know not by your Means and Measures? You may next say, It must be by Sense, Fantasie and Species, as our Souls work in these muddy Brains. God's Knowledge receiveth not a constitutive Object from without, as ours doth. It first concurrerth with his Will and Power in making all things what they are (All flowing from it, and receiving from none:) And in *secundo instanti*; it discerneth all things to be what they are. And when he hath made Propositions, he discerneth them to be true. You keep your way and say [*When God declares things to come, he declareth something, because there is a Proposition: But when he fore-knoweth them, he fore-knoweth nothing; which is not to fore-know.*] *Ans.* 1. When God declareth by Propositions things to come, the Propositions are the Declaration it self and are something; but the things declared are nothing, till they are. Why would you confound these? and When he foreknoweth what will be, he knoweth that it is not: *Ergo* it is not. 3. How prove you, That to fore-know from Eternity that there would be no World till the Creation, or no Deluge, Resurrection, &c. till the time, is no fore-knowledge? I do not Dispute it with you, but crave your proof, having said somewhat my self elsewhere upon that Question. You talk of [*a thing's beginning to be Future before it's put into a Proposition*]

on, &c.] As if you still begg'd the Question, and took Futurity *extra mentem* & *signa*, to be something *ex parte rei*. That which is not, is not true. *A negatione est secundi Adjecti ad negationem Est tertii valet consequentia*, saith Dr. Twisse often. You ask [Is it true because formed into a Proposition? Then all Propositions are true.] Ans. Is what true? That there is a *Futurum*? Is not that a Proposition? What is it antecedent to the Proposition that you call true? Is it the *res futura*? That's false. Is it the *Realitas futurationis ex parte rei*? That is it I deny. *Futurum*, saith Dr. Twisse, & *possibile*, are *termini diminuentes*, signifying that the thing is not. Is it the *Conceptus Divinus*? If that be by a mental Proposition, it is not antecedent to it self; if not, doubtless God's Knowledge is true (efficiently, it will make the thing true) and true perfectly and denominatively, knowing things but as they are, and therefore not knowing *Futurity Rei* to be a Being. If it be human Conceptions, they are mental Propositions, not eternal nor antecedent to themselves. All Propositions that God maketh are true: Because true Propositions are true, must all be true? Because it is a word or Proposition or Syllogism, which is the Subject of Logical truth, doth it follow that all Words, Propositions or Syllogisms are true?

Ad 9. Possible is a notion relative from God's Power; *Futurity* from his Will, or any certain Cause. Neither is a real Entity in *re*.

In the Conclusion I was about to wish that you would have done somewhat that tended to my Edification, and when you had all this while talk'd for the Entity of *futurity* that you would have deign-

ed to tell me what it is; if it be any thing, why would you not say, what? Is it a Substance or an Accident? What Accident (or mode) or of what Substance? Could you forget that this would be expected from you? And whether *Futurity* be annihilated or turned into somewhat else when the thing existeth. But I find that you have made a kind of attempt, saying [*Things have an esse intentionale in God's will, though not an esse Reale in themselves.*] And is this all that we shall have instead of the Definition, that should have gone before, and instead of regarding and Answering what I had said of the Point? 1. Here then you intimate that *Futurity* hath no *esse reale* in it self; and it is the *esse reale* that I denied: Why lost you so much Labour. 2. Can you English to any man that takes words for means of understanding things, what it is for [*Things to have an esse intentionale in God?*] 1. Sure the common Doctrine of *esse intentionale* in man, needs an *Oedipus*. 2. But alas how shall I know what *esse intentionale* is in God? 3. Much less how millions of millions of *Nothings* have their *esse intentionale* in God. *Qu.* 1. Is that *esse intentionale* any thing real besides God himself? 2. Are such *esse's* as many in God as the things will be in themselves? Hath God Accidents, and so many millions of millions of Accidents, and yet most simple and immutable? 3. What are all these things in God from eternity in proper language? are they his *Volitions* or *Intellections*? And are these so numerous? Or are they Creatures in *esse intentionali*? Do not you confess that that *esse* is *non-esse* as to any Creature? If you mean *Platonick Idea's*, are not *Idea's* and *Species*, as they are

are called, in man, the notes of his Imperfection, while his Soul knoweth, *ut forma*, in a Body, as distinct from perfect intuition? I refer you to what I have said of Divine *Idea*'s, and pray you to feign nothing in God without proof. But if you do prove such, forget not the next time, that I denied not the truth of any Divine *Idea* or Knowledge.

Your concluding line I pardon, and it needs no more. All that is said in this Paper on this point is materially fully answered in my Book; and I even now asked a Friend what I should say to all that object against a Book which containeth sufficient matter of answer to their Objections: And he answered, Not write for every man a new one, but wish them to read the former better.

Pardon my oft repeating to you my sence of *Futurity*, with which I conclude. To man, Time in various instants, and the narrowness of our understandings, that must have various Conceptions and Organical Notions, make it needful to us to use names, even for things that are not (or *nothings*). When God (or any certain Cause) tells what will be hereafter, we frame an image of that thing that is not by the help of Words and the similitude of Things that are or have been. Then we put a name on that imagined thing, as if it were: Then we make use in our discourses of that name, and turning a Verb into a Noun, as [*it will be*] into [*Future*], and then an *Adjective* or *Participle* into a *Substantive*, [*Future*] into [*Futurity*] our poor Fancies run on with it, as if we had by the name made or mentioned some Substance or real Being. When all is no-

thing but a Relative notion or *Ens rationis*. The knowledge that a thing will be may be a real knowledge : And instead of denominating the Act we denominate the Object, (which is internally an Image ; externally Nothing real) and call it *Future*, and thence name *Futurition* : As *Futurition* signifieth improperly the relation of the mental act to the thing fore-known, it is a real mental act's relation : As the Subject is the thing *future*, so it is nothing real but a feigned organical Notion, by which we discourse instead of *Verbs*. The *Relatio Conceptus vel nominis*, is the relation of a real act. But the relation of the thing *future* as *future* is *secundum dici*, but feigned instead of a *Verb*. And of God's knowledge, I shall here say no more.

In a word, If you take *futurition rei* to be the Name of any immanent eternal Act of God, whatever we think of the aptitude of your Phrase, I suppose we differ not about the thing intended, as long as you hold no eternal Accidents or Composition in God, and that nothing is eternal but himself ; which I must think you do in Charity. If you take *futurition rei* for the *modus* or relation of a humane Conception or Assertion *de futuris*, I suppose we shall not differ *de re*, nor will you say that it is eternal. 3. If you speak but suppositively, that if there had been such a *conceptus* or Assertion from Eternity, it would have been true, we differ not. 4. If you take *Futurition extra mentem*, to be any thing (Substance, Mode, Accident or any Reality or *aliquid rei*) and that from Eternity, I deny it, and say, That they that make an universal Spirit, and they that make Matter and Motion to be eternal

nal with God, are more excusable, than they that make a thing called *Futurity* distinct from God ; yea, the *Futurity* of Sin to be eternal, and God the eternal Cause of that eternal Effect.

I purposed at the first glance to have answered the second Paper also about God's decreeing Sin ; but when I had read it I was unwilling, 1. Because it is but too largely answered materially in my Book already, and more fully in old Papers that lie by me, which I cannot transcribe. 2. Because I hear so much Good of the worthy Author, that I am not willing to be drawn to dispute a Case, which cannot be handled justly, without opening so much Evil in that which I must oppose, as will sound harsh towards one that I so much honour. Men are so apt to feel that as touching themselves which is spoken to their Cause. If *Hobbes* (who wrote the Treatise of Necessity against Bishop *Bramhall*) had sent me that Paper, I should readily have answer'd it : But here I fear it.

Only I tell the Author, that I have been as strongly tempted that way as most others ; and do acknowledge that it is the greatest difficulty in all these Controversies, to conceive, how free will can act otherwise than God doth predetermine it : But I am satisfied in the Solution ; and fully satisfied, that the Predeterminant Opinion which I oppose doth certainly infer the Religion of *Hobbes*, the denial of Christianity, and leaves us no Religion ; but that Good and Evil, Happiness and Misery are Differences all made by God himself, as Light and Darkness, Angels and Serpents are made to differ by him :

And I am not willing to let go Christianity for such Objections as these: And it had been meet that he had answered what I have said to *Alvarez*, *Mr. Sterry*, &c on this Subject, and taken notice of my Answers to the most of his.

His talk of Casualty is his sum; by which if he mean that which had not a predetermined Cause, Sin is casual, till the Sinner determine his own will. But if he mean, that which is unknown to God, it is not casual: And the Assertion, That such things are not knowable to God, I have confuted at large, which he here taketh no notice of.

If I shall find that Necessity make it my duty to give any such Paper a particular Answer, if I have time, I may do it. But I think enough is said of that already, and my leisure from better work is small.

R. I. BAXTER.

C H A P. VII.

*Of God's Providence, and predetermining Pre-
motion and Miracles.*

S. 1. **T**HE word (*Providence*) is variously used by Writers: Sometimes as comprehending God's fore-knowledge and decrees themselves: Sometimes as comprehending all his Works: Some-

Sometimes as comprehending all his works which follow the *Creation*: And sometimes as signifying only his *effective disposal* of *Persons* and *Things* in *Motions*, and *Alterations*, as distinct from *Legislation*, which only maketh *Duty* and *Right*.

§. 2. In CREATION God Glorified his Three Essential Principles or Attributes: 1 His *Omnipotency* eminently in giving BEING to all things. 2. His *Wisdom* eminently in the ORDER and Composure of all: 3. His *Love* or *Goodness* eminently, in the GOODNESS and Wellfare of all: For he made them *Good*, and then *Rested*: Yet so as that all these Attributes were glorified in each part of the Effect.

§. 3. From hence *a posteriore* he is in the one Relation of CREATOR Related triply to the World, and 'specially to the Rational part: That is, 1. As the MAKER of things, (which is *Creator* in the narrow sence). 2. As ORDINATOR. 3. As BENEFACTOR. And thus he is the Author of NATURE.

§. 4. From this fundamental Relation of CREATOR, and the nature of the Creature made (and continued by Conservation, which is a continued Creation or Efficiency) there resulteth a threefold *Right* and further Relation to God. 1. A *Jus Domini*, or Right of PROPRIETY, and so he is our OWNER, and may do with all things what he will, and must be the disposer of Events. 2. His *Jus Imperii* (including *Doctrine*) or Right of Government; which to things meerly *Natural* is *Natural Government*, and to *Moral Agents* it is *Moral Government*, by *Doctrine*, *Laws* and *Executions*: And so he is our KING or RULER. 3. His *Jus Amoris ut finis*;

or Right to be the *end of all*, and by the *Rational Creature* to be *chiefly Loved*, and *absolutely for Himself*, as the *Best* and most *Amiable*, and so he is our *ultimate END*: Where LOVE is considered not only as an act of *Obedience* to a *Rector* as all other *duties* are; but eminently as it is the *final perfective Act* of man, closing with the *final Object*, and so above the common nature of meer Obedience.

§. 5. All God's *after-works* and all our *Duties* to him must be observed as respecting all these *Relations* of God to us, and our answerable *Relations* to him: For therein is the *Nature*, *Order*, and *Harmony* of them discerned to be *Glorious*: And unskillful confounding them is a *spoiling* and *prophaning* or *dishonouring* of them. And thus the *various acts* of *Providence* must be set each in its proper place.

§. 6. God being the *fons natura*, and having settled the frame of *Nature* (or created *Beings* and *second Causes*) in a fixed state and order, in which one thing is united to another, and adapted to its proper work in concurrence with the whole, we must not expect that God do ordinarily violate this his established *Course*: For his *Works* shall shew somewhat of his *Constancy*, and Experience telleth us, that *really* thus He doth.

§. 7. But we must not dream that God is *involuntarily* tied to his own *Work*, or hindered by *second Causes*, or the *course* of *Nature*, from doing what He would; but His free-will delighteth it self in this *Constancy* and ordered *Course* of *Nature*, and use of *second Causes*, which have
still

still all their being, force and order continued by Him.

§. 8. And the number and operations of second Causes are so unknown to us, that when things seem *Miracles to us*, it is hard for us to say, that God useth *no second Cause* in effecting them. But it is enough to the use of Miracles to know that their extraordinary production hath an answerable extraordinary use and signification of God's Will.

§. 9. And no doubt but Nature and all its parts are absolutely in the Power and Government of God's Will : And He can and doth turn things up and down as He pleaseth, without making any breach in his established Order : If the Husbandman can turn the course of Rivers to water his Grounds, by meer Impediments and Receptivities, without any alteration of the natural motion of the Water ; how much more must we ascribe to God, in using Nature without overthrowing it ?

§. 10. It is Atheistical or absurd to set God and Nature in *opposition, competition or separation* ; and to say as some Philosophers, [*This or That natural Causes can do without calling in God as the Determiner.*] Whereas *natural Causes* are nothing, and do nothing but by God : And there is no less of God in the effects of Nature, than if He did the same himself alone : In Him we Live and Move, and Are.

§. 11. And it is no better in them that say, that God doth not operate *proximately and immediately* where Nature or second Causes work, but only *remotely*. As [*immediately*] signifieth [*without any medium or second Cause*] so God doth not then

then work *immediately*: But as it signifieth *proximately*, He doth: For an *infinite being* cannot be *essentially distant* from any Creature or Effect: Nor is it possible that the *second Cause* can be *nearer* to the *Effect* than God; who is as near as if he used no such Cause.

§. 12. And the Dispute, Whether God do *proximately effect immediatione suppositi*, or only *virtutis*, seemeth to have a false supposition, *viz.* That God's *Virtue* is not his *suppositum*, and that the *virtus divina* may be where the *suppositum* is not. If by *suppositum* they mean God's *Essence* as *Essence existing*, and by *virtus* they mean his *Essence under the formal notion of Power, Wisdom and Love*, then they are but two inadequate Conceptions of the same simple Being, and therefore God thus ever *operateth immediatione essentie & virtutis essentialis*. But if they mean, that God hath a *virtus* which is neither his *Essence* nor a Creature, we believe them not.

§. 13. The Controversie between *Durandum* and his Followers, and the Jesuites and Dominicans, about the necessity of a *moving Concourse*, besides the support of Nature, seemeth to me thus reconcilable.

1. God as he is *fons nature*, is the *Living God*, the *prime Active Principle*, who by constant vital Activity is the Spring of all the Action in the World; and is not to be dreamt of as one that had made the World, and then left it to it self, and withdrew his hand and is fallen asleep.

2. But the *Living God* moveth not all things alike, but every thing according to its nature and place; for his *Influx* is received *ad modum recipientium*.

3. The

3. The Nature of some Creatures is essentially *Active*, and so inclined to act that they *will act* if their Nature be not by others, or want of concurrent Necessaries, hindered. Such is every Soul or living Principle, and Fire. And other Creatures are naturally *Passive* only *ex se* (or at least principally). So that for God to continue Fire or Souls or any *naturally-active Principle*, is to continue a nature essentially inclined to move or act.

4. It is supposed that these Natures are not solitary, but parts of the *universe*, and are continued with all necessary circumstant Beings and Objects; and that the whole frame of Nature and co-operating Causes are continued: *e. g.* That the Sun doth not stand still, while the Life of a Plant or Brute is continued.

5. All this being supposed by *Durandus*, *Aureolus*, a *Dela*, and all sober men, the Question debated is, *Whether there be further necessary another immediate Divine Motion or Concurrence to every motion of a Creature natural or free, besides all this aforesaid?*

And, 1. Let it be consider'd, that God's *Essence* being but one, his Act, which *ex parte agentis*, is his *Essence*, is not distinguishable, saving *ex connotatione effectus*: And if this be all that is meant, That as *ipse motus distinguitur a causis*, so God's Will, Power and Agency may be distinctly denominated, 1. As from the *second Causes*; and 2. also from the *Motion it self*, as more than the *Causes*; this none can deny, nor is it a Controversie. But if the question be of the necessity of another distinct way of *Divine Causation* of the *motus*, besides that by *second Causes* before mentioned, they can prove no such necessity.

For

For is it *mediate* or *immediate* Causation or Efficiency which they mean? (we speak not of *immediate* as it signifieth *proximate*, which is granted, but as signifying *sine causis secundis*.) If it be *mediate* by second Causes that God must further concurr, those are *natural Causes* or *some other*: if *natural*, it's a contradiction to say, that *Besides God's moving by natural Causes* (which is granted) he must also move by *natural Causes*; as if *Idem* were not *Idem*: Unless they will say it must be by some other natural Causes, which they do not, nor can assign; nor yet any other that are not natural.

But if they mean, that to every motion there must be an *immediate operation* of God to it *without* that which he doth by *second Causes*, even by *God alone without any second Cause*, I then ask, *Doth God move any thing in the World by any second Cause or not?* If *not*, then not by the *Sun*; not the *Coach* by the *Horses*, the *Arrow* by the *Bow*, the *Stone* by the *Hand*, the *Pen* by the *Writer*, &c. If *yea*, then is it the *whole* or *part* only of that motion which is made by second Causes and God by them? If the *whole*, *habetur quæsitum*: If *part*, how prove you that God cannot make the whole motion himself by *second Causes*, as well as *part*, but must needs leave the other part of the *same motion* to be done without *second Causes*.

And it would follow that *no second Cause*, no not the noblest in the *World* (as the *Sun*) and *God as acting by it*, hath and exerciseth à *vis adequata* to the smallest motion even of a *Leaf*: Whereas God in *Nature* maketh *natural Power*, with his own, as he is *fons nature*, adequate to its *Actions*.

And

And let unbyassed Reason judge, Whether if a Rock should be held up in the Air, if God continue the *natural Gravity* of it, with all the rest of the frame of Nature, *could* not that Rock fall, without another motion of God which is without any second Cause, to thrust it down? If He continue the nature of *Fire*, was it not a greater Miracle, that it burnt not the three Witnesses, *Dan. 3.* than to have burnt them, or than its ordinary Action? Why else should there need ten thousand fold more *natural Power* to hold up the said Rock, or to quench a City on fire, or to stop a River, or the Winds; than to move them supposing natural Causes, if there need an *Infinite Power* moreover to the *act*, and none to the *cessation*? And by this Rule it would follow, that all Motion in the World is supernatural: For if God cause it *ut sons natura*, he causeth it in the natural course: if he do not, it's all supernatural and miraculous.

Moreover, if all this satisfie not Disputes, if it be worth the Cost, they may try the Case thus: Supposing that God hath told no man his Secrets, when he will *immediately* move any thing *without second Causes*, and that no second Causes, nor his own Operation by them can move any thing without *another immediate Motion*, Let them cut down the Pillars, or undermine their Houses, and say that by meer natural Causes the House cannot fall: Let them set fire on their Houses, and say that by meer natural Causes they cannot be burnt: Let them drink Poison, and say, By meer natural Causes it cannot hurt us: Or let them cut their Flesh, &c. For God never told them, that

that he will *immediately concurr*, and then there is no danger.

Perhaps they will say, That Experience telleth us that God doth usually concurr with them: I answer, And is not that because he worketh by them? What Experience or Reason have you, that God should *still* work *immediately with them*, and yet *not by them*? We can prove that He worketh as the *first Cause*. But if you will prove that He doth it not as the *first Cause* moving the *second Causes*, but by *immediate concomitancy*, let us hear your proofs.

Lastly, let it be noted, that when they that affirm all Motion to be by immediate concomitant Concourse or Predetermination, do pretend that they do it lest God's Causality should be denied or extenuated, it is a meer deceit: For all are agreed, that there is no *less of God* in the Operations done by *second Causes* or *Nature*, than in *immediate Operations* without second Causes (such as God exerciseth on the first created *Motor*, and how else he please) God is as much in one as in the other.

§. 14. For the understanding of the nature and use of miraculous acts of Providence, it must be considered, 1. That God that made the World of Natural Agents, and things Passive, moved by the Active, is not to be feigned without good proofs, to alter any of the Works which he hath made, which we see he continueth in the course that he made them without any mutation of their Natures.

§. 15. God can change, and cross, and use as he pleaseth the Actions of Natural Agents without changing their natures and inclinations. One

Natu-

Natural Agent or moved Passive, may be resisted and turned back or overcome by another; and yet there may be nothing but natural motion in them all: A stronger Stream may drive back a weaker. A Canon may cross the ordinary motion of the Air: As a great Dog may master a little one, or a Woolf devour a Lamb, and a Bird a Worm or Fly; and yet there be none but natural and sensitive motion. So God can dry up or stop the *Red Sea* or *Jordan*; and by Winds carry *Caterpillars* to and from *Egypt*, and such like, and by one natural motion overcoming another. It's hard for us in most Miracles to say that God doth more than this.

§. 16. But it is certain that God hath a rank of free Agents that act arbitrarily, and that these have a great measure of power over natural and necessary Motions: As man is a free Agent and driveth his Sheep to what Pasture he pleaseth, and guideth his Horses and Oxen in their way and furrow to do his will by their natural and sensitive necessitated motion, and as a *Miller* can make the natural course of the Wood and Water and Mill-stones, and Horse, all to serve his intention, without changing the nature of any one of them, so much more can God and free Agents under God, attain their freely chosen ends, by Ordering and not Changing Natural and Sensitive Movers.

§. 17. We so little know what Arbitrary Free Agents that are invisible Spirits God hath set over this Passive World, and what power he hath given them to use Natural Agents as they themselves freely will, that it greatly disableth
us

us to resolve all the Difficulties of the Cause of Sin and Misery, and about the nature of Miracles. But it is a clear truth that it is by such Free *Arbitrary Agents* primarily that natural Agency is crost and overcome in Miracles, tho one *Natural Agent* be employed to resist another, (as to quench the heat of Fire, to stop the course of Winds and Water, &c.) Yet it is some voluntary *free Agent* that thus useth *natural Agents* against each other. Scripture tells us, that God useth Angels as Rulers and Protectors of lower Agents: And that there is a kind of a war between these and Devils: And how far the prevalent Wills of good and bad Angels or voluntary Agents may be the Cause of Evil, or be the Actors of Miracles, by setting one moved Agent against another, and yet all but Natural motion that is caused by these free Agents, Mortals do not know; and therefore should not be peremptory in judging.

§. 18. But though we know not that in Miracles God useth not second Causes, some natural and some free in waies unsearchable to us, yet may we be assured by Miracles of his will and attestation: when we find that things are done quite out of the way of his ordinary Providence in the uncontroled confirmation of some prophetical Revelation: For God is the Governour of the rational World; and his moral Government must be by the intelligible signification of his will *de debito, what shall be due from us*, and *to us*: And if Miracles be used to deceive us, they cannot be done without him, whatever second Cause there be: And if he should use them (tho^t by second Causes) to deceive us, we are utterly

re-

remediless, and therefore guiltless. And God that hath neither impotency, ignorance nor badness, cannot need a Lye to govern Man; when he hath made it part of his Image, on Man, and needful to Mens Justice to each other to hate Lying.

§. 19. A Miracle controuled by contrary Evidence, is no notification of God's Attestation: It may be permitted for several good ends: For God by controuling it giveth us sufficient remedy against Deceit. And there are two waies by which a Miracle may be controuled: First, by greater conquering Miracles used for some contrary Doctrine or Cause; so the *Egyptian* Magician's Miracles were controuled by *Moses*. Secondly, when it is some unquestionable Truth or Duty or Word, that is already better proved, which that Miracle pretendeth to contradict. As if a Miracle were done by a Deceiver, to prove that there is no God, no Life-to-come, or against Mercy or Justice, or to disprove Christianity; the greater Miracles which have confirmed the Gospel, and the evident Light of Nature, which proveth the Deity and Life-to-come, and the Duty of Love and Justice, do controul such deceiving Miracles. (Therefore a Servant of Christ may most comfortably suffer Martyrdome for his testimony to the Deity, Christianity, the Life-to-come, or Charity and Justice against Malice and Persecution and Cruelty, which even a Miracle would not justifie; more than for a disputable Opinion.)

§. 20. It's a great Question, How a true Prophet might be known antecedently, before his Prophecy was fulfilled. And it's of great moment to consider, the difference between a Legislative Prophet, and a meer particular Message. *Moses*

and CHRIST, the Legislators, confirmed their Laws and Word by multitudes of uncontrouled Miracles: For Life and Death lay upon mens Obedience or Disobedience to them: And if a Prophet did reprove any Sin against that Law, the Miracles that confirmed the Law did justifie them. But if it were but a Prophecy about some other temporal Event (as *Jeremy's* of the Captivity) it needed no Miracle; for it was but a temporal Suffering that followed the not believing them.

The Law of God, which should here be handled, I shall speak of afterward.

Pardon the disorder of not handling the Law before Sin:

It is for young Readers sake, who would have all God's Laws opened together, to give Light to each other.

C H A P. VIII.

Of God's causing or not causing Sin.

§. 1. **H**OW certainly the Doctrine of the necessity of immediate, efficient, physical, pre-determining Premotion, doth make God the principal Cause of all Sin, I have so oft shewed, and so fully proved, that I shall here be very short upon that Subject.

§. 2. To say, that God is the principal determining Cause of every sinful act with all its Objects and Circumstances (called the *materiale peccatum*) and also the Cause of the Law that forbiddeth it, and the Person that committeth it, is to make him the

the chief Cause of Sin, as far as it is capable of a Cause, even of the formal Cause.

§. 3. To say, That such a Cause is the Cause only of the *Act*, but not of the *Obliguity*, is absurd; because the obliquity is a *Relation* necessarily resulting from the Law and Act with all its *modes* and *circumstances*: And the obliquity can have no other Cause.

§. 4. To say, That God willeth and loveth and causeth Sin, not as Sin, but for *good ends* and *uses*, is, to say no more for God than may be said for wicked men, if not for Devils; save only that God's Ends are better than theirs.

§. 5. To say, That God willeth not Sin, but the *Existence* and *Furnity* of Sin, is but as aforesaid, to say, that He *wills* not Sin *as Sin*, or *sub ratione mali*, but that it exist for better ends; or else it is a contradiction: For to *will* or *cause Sin* is nothing else but to *will* and *cause the existence* of Sin.

§. 6. They that say, That God willeth the *Existence of Sin*, as it is *summe conducibile*, to the Glory of his Justice and Mercy, (yea, and that *per se*, and not only *per accidens*) do wrong the Glory of God's Holiness and Wisdom. A Physician can love his own skill, and compassion, and the honour that cometh to him by curing a Disease, without loving or willing the Disease it self, but only supposing it as *an Evil* which he can turn to Good.

§. 7. They that say, That God is the *Cause* indeed of *our Sin*, but is no Sinner himself, because he is under no Law, say nothing in the latter but what all grant, and nothing in the former but what

God's Church doth commonly abhor, excepting some few singular presumers.

§. 8. They that hold, That God doth by immediate physical efficient predetermining Promotion principally and unresistibly cause every sinful act, with all its modes and circumstances, do certainly deny all certainty of Faith, and so subvert all Christianity : For the formal Object of all Divine Faith, is *God's Veracity*, (that God cannot lye) if God could lye, our Belief could have no certainty : Now God speaketh to us, but by *inspired men*, and not by an *essential voice* of his own : And if God cause, as aforesaid, all the Lyes that ever were spoken by Men or Devils in the World, then no man can be sure that he doth not so by Prophets and Apostles, or that ever they say true : And God's *Veracity* then is gone.

§. 9. They that think to evade this Evidence by the difference of *Predetermination* and *Inspiration*, and say God *inspireth* no Lyes though he *predetermine* all by *physical Promotion*, do labour in vain : For, 1. No man can ever prove that any Inspiration doth interest God more in the Act or Lye, than physical Predetermination doth : For how can God be more the Author of any Act than by effectual premoving the Creature to act it, and that by immediate physical Predetermination ? What doth Inspiration do, but so move the *Mind, Will* and *Tongue* of a Prophet ? No man can name more that Man is capable of. 2. But if there were a difference, we are not capable of understanding that difference so well, as to prove that God can cause all the Lyes in the World by *predetermining Promotion*, and yet can cause none by

by *Inspiration*; shall none believe him that know not this difference? 3. And were it *intelligible*, it would be only to *inspired men* themselves. So that I am past doubt that we must part with all *Certainty of Christianity*, and of all *Divine Belief*, if we receive this Doctrine of Predetermination, because the *objectum formale fidei* is then gone.

§. 10. They that say, that if we make not God the Predeterminer to every act *in specie morali*, and in every *comparative respect* and mode, we shall make Man a *God*, by making him a *Causa prima*, do thereby as much conclude God to be the first and principal predetermining efficient Cause of every wicked *Habit* (as of *Malignity*, or *Hatred of God*, &c.) because a *Habit* hath as much *Entity* as an Act: Therefore if it deifie Man, to make him the first Cause, *e. g.* of a *Lye* or *Murder*, *in specie*, then so it will do to make him the first Cause of the *Habit*.

§. 11. If it be as impossible for Man to do any thing but what he doth, or not to do all that he doth without God's foresaid predetermining Premotion, as it is to be *Gods*, or to overcome *God*, or *make a World*, then if Men are counted Sinners, and condemned, it is for not doing such impossibilities, for not doing what God alone can do, or for not overcoming Almighty premoving Power.

§. 12. It cannot rationally be expected, that they that believe that God is the chief *Cause* and *Willer* of all Sin, should think it *very bad*, or themselves *bad for it*; or that when God hath irresistibly made all men to sin, he yet hateth it, and sent his Son into the World to testifie his Hatred by dying for it; and that he is serious in

all that he saith against it in his word: nor that
such men should hate it, and rather *die than sin*.

§. 13. Therefore as the Church of God hath
ever abhorred to make God the Cause of Sin, and
kept up the sence of the Evil of Sin, (for our ha-
tred of it, and departing from it, and our Humi-
liation) as a necessary part of our Religion, so
must we resolutely do still; or else we shall be
worse than the Light of Nature teacheth Hea-
thens themselves to be.

§. 14. God hath many waies to cause the Ef-
fects of Sin, without causing the *Sin it self*; as by
impediments to other waies, by altering Recipi-
ents, Objects, Concauses, and many others, which
I have elsewhere enumerated: He can *will* and
procure, that Christ shall die by the sinful malice
and action of the *Jews*, without willing or cau-
sing their malice, will or action as bad: As he can
procure a man to be in the way where a Murde-
rer cometh with a disposition to murder, and can
direct the Bullet, &c.

§. 15. When one and the same word doth sig-
nifie both the *Sin* and the *Effect* of the Sin, it oc-
casioneth the error of men that cannot distinguish:
And so if the Scripture should say, That God is the
Cause of it, they think it includeth the Sin with
the Effect. So *Murder* signifieth both the *will* and
action of the Murderer, and the *death* of the man
murdered as the *effect*: *Absolom's* Constuprations
signifieth both his *sinful will* and *action*, and the
effect of both: The revolt of the *Israelites* from Je-
roboam; the giving up of Kingdoms to the Beast,
and many such-like, in Scripture are ascribed to
God as the Cause, not as the words signifie the
sinful will and *action* of the Malefactor, but only the

the produced effect of both (saying when God's permission only is understood.)

§. 16. They that deride it as absurd, that God should decree, will and cause the Effect, and not the Wills forbidden Act, are too bold with God, in measuring his Counsels and Actions by the rule of their vain Imaginations: Yet many give us, instead of Scripture and Reason, but such a confident derision, and say, [*How absurd is it to say that God willed, decreed and caused that Christ should be murdered, and yet willed, decreed or caused not that any should murder him? That God should will and cause David's Concubines to be defiled, and not will or cause that Absalom should defile them? That He should will and cause the Kingdom to be rent from Rehoboam, and yet not cause any one to will or do it? &c.*] But is all false that is not agreeable to their imagination? Or is this a convincing way of reasoning? It is not from imperfection but perfection that God doth not will or cause mens Sin: But it is from his perfection that he causeth the effect, as being the Lord and Ruler of the World. Sin is not a capable Object of God's Volition, or an effect which he can cause: But the effect is, God cannot love or cause Judas's will or act (in specie) of betraying Christ, nor the Jews will or act in murdering him: But God can will and cause, that Christ shall be betrayed and killed, by such individual persons as he foreknew were by their wickedness disposed thereunto.

§. 17. All good men have so deep a hatred of Sin, and zeal for God's Holiness, and confess, that Sin is of the Devil, and it is his special character to be the Author of it, that when zeal against an Adversary in Disputation can yet make

many put that character on God (yea, as the prime Efficient, which is more than a Tempter) and this as a part of the Honour of his Providence, and think they serve God and his Truth, by bitter reviling the contrary-minded, it is a dreadful instance how far Faction and Contentious Zeal may carry men. And yet when we see how carefully many avoid Sin when they have thus honoured it as God's work, it is a notable instance how far good men may err in notions, and yet practically hold the contrary truth, and what great notional Errors must be pardoned to each other, as they are pardoned of God.

§. 18. *God punisheth Sin with Sin, without causing that Sin at all ; that is, 1. He justly denieth his Grace to the rejecters of it, and their Sin is the consequent of that Privation, as a drunken man's wandering is to ones denying to lead him : 2. God maketh it a punishment when man hath first made it a Sin. [q. d. If thou wilt commit such a Sin, it shall have this penal nature and effect.]* As if in the Law of Nature God decreed, that excess of Drink or Meat should breed Sickness, that taking a sweet Poison should torment you, that Venery should bring the Pox, that Prodigality shall impoverish men, &c. Here Man first maketh it a Sin, and then God maketh it a Punishment : And Sin it self being the deformity and misery of the Soul, hath two relations at once (in time); the first in order of Nature is the *sinfulness*, caused by Man ; and the second the *penal relation* caused by God ; whose Act indeed was antecedent in his Law (of Nature), making Nature such, that it should so suffer if it will so do ; and yet the *Effect* is consequent to mans Act.

C H A P. IX.

Of Natural Power and Free-will.

§. 1. **T**HE Glory of God on his Works is their expression of his Perfections, by the Impression of them which he hath made. And He hath communicated Being and Substantiality as the *substratum*, and therein the Virtues of *Vital Power*, *Wisdom* and *Goodness* (or Love): and these are his Image upon Man.

§. 2. The more *Power* therefore a Creature hath, the more he glorifieth the *Power of God*: And the most *powerful* Creatures (as the Sun) do more shew forth his *greatness* than the most *important*. Therefore to deny or extenuate any *Power* given of God, is to dishonour him in his works: So absurd is it to think that the *Power* ascribed to Man, is *dishonourable* to God; as if you took from the Workman all the Praise that you give to his Works.

§. 3. All *Man's Power* is *passive* from *GOD* and *superiour Causes*, but it is naturally *active* as to things *inferiour*, and in it self.

§. 4. God endued man at first with a threefold Power, 1. *Natural*, 2. *Moral*, 3. *Political*, which is a *Ruling Power* over *Inferiours*.

§. 5. Man's Power was partly *essential* or *inseparable*, and partly *accidental* or *separable*. 1. To have the three Powers or Faculties of *Vital Activity*, *Intellection* and *Will*, is *essential*, and Man cannot

not be a Man without them : But to have these in promptitude and strength, is but as health or strength to the Body ; a separable thing. 2. To have some moral Power to know and desire and practise some moral Good, it seemeth is inseparable from Man *in via* ; for all men naturally have some *notitia communes*, and differencing sense of moral Good and Evil : Else men should be as bad as Devils : But to be truly Holy was separable (as Health) and so was lost. 3. To have some superiority over Brutes, and Parents over their Children, it seems is inseparable, or is not separated ; for it continueth in Nature : But the true Majesty of this superiority was lost by Sin.

§. 6. No Creature hath any Power but what is totally derived from God and dependent on him, and still upheld by him and used under him.

§. 7. Though some would have more Power ascribed to Nature, and others appropriate more to Grace, yet in this it is no Controversie, How much is to be ascribed to God : For both Nature and Grace, and the Powers of both are totally from God : But all the question is, Which way God giveth it to man.

§. 8. In general we should be most cautious,
1. That we disparage not any Power or Endowment which is God's own Work, whether natural or gracious. 2. That we give not too much to any Work that is proper to Man.

§. 9. Natural Power, of Vital Action, Intellection and Volition, is supposed by God as Lawgiver in his Subjects ; that is, that we are Men.

§. 10. Every act of Knowledge, Faith, Repentance, Love and Obedience is done by our natural Powers or Faculties, and none without them.

§. 11. The word [*Moral Power*] signifieth,
 1. Sometimes a *Power to moral actions*, (and so *natural Power in Man* is also *moral* in some degree.)
 2. Sometimes a *Holy Disposition*, especially in the *Will*, to such holy *moral actions*; which is the Rectitude of our natural Powers, or the *Health* of them in a saving degree or sort, and is the Gift of Grace, since Sin departed. 3. Most frequently I use the words for such a degree of God's helping or healing Influx or Grace, as is short of a Habit for promptitude and facility, but yet puts the soul in such a disposition, by which Man can do the Act, (and it may come to pass without more Grace whether it do or not) which the Dominicans call *Sufficient Grace*, and I rather call *Necessary Grace*. 4. Sometimes it is meant (as *causa moralis*) for that which is *Power Reputatively*.

§. 12. *Power* hath several degrees: some can act easily, yea, is hardly restrained: some can act with difficulty, yet constantly: some *difficultly* and very rarely: some can act, but the Impediments are so great, and its weakness such, as that it never will do what it can: And these we call a *moral Impotency*; as being *reputative impotency*, in these three last degrees.

§. 13. *Sin* hath debilitated Man's very natural *Vivacity* and *Activity* to things spiritual, and also darkened and undispensed his *Understanding* to them; but especially *disaffected* him, and perverted his will, with an *indisposition*, *averseness* and *enmity* to God. And none of these are cured, but by the Grace of Christ; quickening (or strengthening and awakening) illuminating and converting the Soul. (Of which more after in due place.)

§. 14. *Adam*

§. 14. *Adam* had *Power* to have stood when he fell: God took no power from him, nor let out such a *Temptation* as he could not resist: But *Sin* entered at *his Will*, and corrupted it before he lost his *Power*.

§. 15. There is therefore in *verum natura*, such a thing as a *true Power*, to do *more good* and *less evil* than we do.

§. 16. And there was such a *Power* in *Adam's Will*, by which he could have *willed* what he did not *will*, and by which he could have rejected the *Temptation*: And this without any other *Grace*, than that which he then had, and used not.

§. 17. Otherwise all the sin of *Adam* and the *World* would be resolved into the necessitating *Will* and *Work* of *God*, and so all *Faith* would be subverted.

§. 18. Therefore *Man's Will* was such a Faculty as could be a *causa prima*, of the *moral modification* or specification of its own *Acts*: (Not a *causa prima simpliciter*, but thus, *secundum quid*.) For else *God* must be the *causa prima* of *Sin*, which is the ill modification of that *Act*.

§. 19. I know that to *Nature* the Reasonings of our late *Infidels*, to prove, That every *Act* of the *Will* is as truly necessitated as the motions of a *Clock*, do seem plausible and hard to answer; because it seemeth strange, that in any *mode of Action* *Man* should be a *first Cause* of it, and that a *Creature's Act* should have no superiour Cause in any *mode*: But on the other side the Evidence is cogent, 1. That *God* is able to make a *self-determining Power*, that can thus do: For it is no contradiction. 2. That it is congruous, that below

low the happy Race of confirmed Spirits, there should be a Race of such undetermined *free Agents*, left much to their own self-determining Power.

3. And *Experience* perswadeth us *de facto*, that so it is. 4. And they that deny it, must unavoid-

ably make God the *prime Cause of all Sin*, in a higher degree than it is or can be ascribed to Satan: And is all this with the rejection of Christianity more eligible, than the Concession that God can and doth make a Creature with such *self-determining Free-will*, as

can, as a first Cause of its *modified act*, sin without God's *Predetermination*? And by his help could forbear Sin when he doth not. The Con-

Of the divers sorts of Freedom of Will, and the fuller opening them, see my Methodus Theologiae, and Cath. Theol.

test is, Whether G O D or Man shall be counted the *causa prima* of Sin; we say, Man is the *first Cause*, and G O D is *none* at all: Some say, God must be the *causa prima* of all that can have a Cause in it: and rather than deny him the Honour which is given to *Satan*, they will deny Christianity, and deny him to be holy and to be G O D.

§. 20. G O D made this natural *Free-will* that Man might be a *governable* Creature, fit to be morally ruled by Laws and rational Motives, and as part of God's Image on Man.

CHAP.

C H A P. X.

Of Original Sin.

§. 1. **B**Y one man Sin entred into the World, and Death by Sin, and so Death passed upon all in that all have sinned.

§. 2. We were not in *Adam* distinct Persons really; for our Persons then existed not; and therefore did not inexist.

§. 3. God doth not repute us to have been what we were not; for he judgeth truly, and is not mistaken: Therefore he judged not *Peter* and *John* to have been those Persons in *Adam* then, nor *Adam's* person the same with theirs.

§. 4. Therefore we were not then when he sinned persons guilty in *Adam*; for *Non existentis non sunt accidentia.*

§. 5. We were *Seminally* or *Virtually* in *Adam* when he sinned: Which is but that he had that *Virtus generativa* from which we naturally sprang in time; But to be *Virtually* in him, is *Not* to be personally in him, but *Potentially*, it being as to *Existence terminus diminuens.*

§. 6. As soon as we were Persons, we were Persons derived by *Generation* from *Adam*: Therefore with our Persons we derived *Guilt* and *Pravity*: For he could beget no better than himself.

§. 7. When *Adam* sinned his whole Person was guilty and no part innocent: Therefore his very *Semen prolificum* had its part in the guilt according to its Capacity; And though it was not a guilty Person,

Person, it was a part of a guilty Person; and a part that was the *Semen persona*; so that when that *Semen* became a person (*Cain*) it became a guilty person, the guilt following the subject according to its Capacity: And so downward by Propagation to this day.

§. 8. God doth not impute *Adam's* Sin to us because *he will do it*, without any real participation of ours; no nor *beyond* our true natural participation, but according to it: Otherwise God should have made us sinners, meerly because he would do so, and not *Adam*.

Dr. Twisse frequently well openeth this.

§. 9. We receive our Original Guilt and Pravity immediately from our next Parents, and but remotely from *Adam*: It cou'd never have come to us but through them from whom we receive our Nature, from them we receive the guilt and pravity of our Nature.

§. 10. Therefore thus far at least our next Parents communicate Guilt and Pravity to us, and not *Adam* only: In which we see that God's Imputation goeth along with real Natural Participation.

§. 11. It seemeth to me a strange oversight in too many Divines who deny (or observe not) our Guilt of all the rest of our Parents

* Sins, while we were in their Loins, as well as of *Adam's*; seeing 1. there is that same reason of both, save what the change of the Covenant maketh (of which after.) And, 2. Scripture is so full and express about it.

* Of this I have published a Disputation which proveth it.

§. 12. 1st, If I have a guilty and depraved Soul from my Parents, it is because I was once in them,
Vir-

Virtually or Seminally as truly and naturally as it was in *Adam*: And had not the Guilt been theirs it had never been mine: And if it be mine because it was theirs, why not one part of theirs as well as another?

§. 13. It will be said, Because God so Covenanted with *Adam* that he should stand or fall for himself and his Posterity: I Answer, That there was any such Covenant that if he stood his Posterity should all stand, or be Confirmed and Saved, is more than ever I found in Scripture or can prove, or do believe; But that it would have been to the *benefit* of his Posterity I doubt not. And that his fall was to the Guilt and Corruption of his Posterity I doubt not; but (as I said) not without and beyond their natural Interest in him, and Derivation from him as the reason of it: And we were as much naturally in our next Parents. And the Covenant of Innocency and the Covenant of Grace do not so far differ as to exempt us from the Guilt of our next Parents sins: For the difference lieth not in this, That the first only made Death the due reward of all Sin, nor that the first did interest Children in the Guilt of their Parents sin: But in this, that the first made us Guilty without a Remedy; But the second giveth us a Remedy presently for Pardon and Recovery, and so our Guilt is not so full, because it is but a half Obligation having the Pardon annexed. The first Law said, [*If thou sin thou shalt be filius mortis, and so shall those that are Propagated of thee.*] The second Covenant saith, [*For thy Original and Actual Sin death is thy due, but I give thee a Pardon and Redemding Grace procured by the Righteousness of Christ.*] But note, That this Covenant pardoneth our Original

Sin as from *Adam*; And yet it followeth not that we had none because it is pardoned: Even so it pardoneth our guilt of our next Parents sins, and therefore we had it to be pardoned: Both are pardonable to us; therefore we had both.

§. 14. 2. And the Scripture is more copious, and as plain in making punishment due to Children for their next Parents sins, as for *Adam's*, though *Adam's* only was the Original of all Sin and Misery. I have elsewhere proved it at large: The Case of *Cain's* Posterity, and *Cham's*, and *Ishmael's*, and *Esau's*, and *Achan's* Family, and *Ahab's*, and many more do fully prove it: And more fully the Second Commandment, and God's declaration of his Name to *Moses*, *Exod.* 34. and many a Threatning to the Seed of the Wicked, and Christ's express Words in *Matth.* 23. 36. so that Scripture puts us out of doubt.

§. 15. The common Objection is, that their [Guilt would be greater on us towards the End of the World, than on them at the Beginning, because all our Ancestours Guilt would be ours.] But I answer, 1. If it were so, it would be but many Obligations to the same Punishment, when it amounteth to that which God seeth our Nature capable of: For a Finite Worm is not capable of more Suffering than is proportioned to his Nature. 2. And this Objection vainly supposeth, that none of our Ancestours Sins were pardoned: Whereas all are pardoned to the Faithful and their Seed, and much Temporal Punishment is pardoned to many of the Unsanctified: And God himself by limiting it to the third and fourth Generation, seemeth to set bounds to his own Justice. 3. And the Guilt of our Parents Sins being of a more Diminute Nature

H

than

than that of our own *Actual Sin* (*Cæteris paribus*) it falleth not so fully on us, as it did on the Committers themselves, nor as our own do. And God offereth us the full pardon of our own and all together: And as long as the Law which tells us of our desert of punishment, doth also give us a free pardon, we have no Cause to complain.

§. 16. That we have all Original Sin is proved, in that else Infants should be saved without a pardoning Saviour, or a cleansing Sanctifier, which cannot be.

§. 17. He that seeth the universal inclination of Mankind to Evil even in their Childhood, and their backwardness to Good, even that Evil and that Good which Nature it self assureth us are such, must needs believe Original Pravity, or else think hardly of God's Work.

§. 18. He that seeth still that Drunkenness, Gluttony, Lust, &c. do vitiate both the Soul and Bodily Temperament of the Sinner, and how frequently a diseased, distempered Body, inclining Men to particuler Vices, and an extraordinarily vitiated Soul, is in their Children the plain fruit of the Parents Sin, may the easilier believe that we drew down Pravity from Adam also, when we derive so much from nearest Parents.

§. 19. And they that consider, that Mans Soul being made Holy, for God, this unholiness is not only a *Negation* but a *Privation*, not of *Sensitive* and *Natural* only, but of *Moral* Rectitude, will not deny but that the name of Sin or *Moral* Pravity belongeth to it.

§. 20. And they that consider, that Parents Cause not Children as an Artificer maketh an Engine, but by *Generation*, which is a *Communication*

tion of their own Essence, and what Natural Interest Parents and Children have in each other; and that it is real Sin that is in both, and that the Moral Privation in its Nature, containeth much of Mans misery, will easily grant that it is both a Sin and Punishment, and a Moral Cause of further punishment, properly enough so called.

§. 21. They that lay that Reason of their denying Original Sin, upon the difficulty of understanding whether Souls are new Created or Derived from Parents, do too little suspect their frail understandings, and their own deductions, and too easily suspect the Word of God. And I think that I have elsewhere proved that *Generative Traduction of Souls*, and yet *God's present, yea, immediate Causation of their Essence* (which may be called *Creation*) are here Consistent: Which here I must not now repeat: *Vid. Meth. Theol. and Reasons of Christian Religion.*

Mr. W. Former put his Opinion for the Traduction of Souls, into his Catechismes: But the Publisher left that out.

C H A P. XI.

Of our Redemption by Christ.

§. 1. SIN having made Man guilty and depraved, unfit for duty and felicity, odious to the most Holy Righteous God, and lyable to his Justice, the eternal Wisdom and Word of God did interpose, and by Mercy did save Man from the deserved rigour of Justice, promising Actual Redemption

in the fulness of time, and on that *supposition* giving fallen Man a *pardoning and saving Law* (of *Covenant of Grace*) with answerable help of his Spirit and Means, and outward Mercies fitted to his Recovery and Salvation.

§. 2. But God would not have this *Recovery and Salvation* to be *perfect* at the *first* ; but gave Man a certain proportion of Common Deliverance and Mercy, binding him to a Course of Duty, in the performance of which he should receive more by degrees till he were perfected. (As Physicians cure their Patients.)

§. 3. Therefore God did enter into Judgment with fallen Man, and did sentence him absolutely to some degree of Punishment, even to Labour, Pain, the penalty of the Cursed Earth, and finally to Death ; which Temporal Punishment God would not remit, nor give him a Saviour to procure the pardon of it ; but only to the Faithful, to turn all this unto their Benefit, and to deliver them from the greater everlasting Sufferings.

§. 4. And their own *sinful pravity* and *privation of Holiness*, and *communion with God*, which also was their *greatest punishment* by Consequence, God would not at once, nor in this Life perfectly save them from ; and therefore accordingly pardoned them their punishment, but by the forementioned degrees. For he is not perfectly pardoned or saved, who is yet left under so much penalty.

§. 5. Some thinking it hard, that for 4000 Years the World should have no *Existent Mediator*, and that an *Existent Faith* in the *future Mediator*, should be more necessary than an *Existent Mediator* and

and his *Work*, and thinking withal that it would solve many Textual Difficulties objected by the *Arians*, and explain the Appearances of Christ to the Patriarchs, have conceived that Christ hath a *threefold Nature*, viz. The *Divine Nature*, a created *Super-Angelical Nature* to which the Divine Nature was united before the Incarnation, and the *Humane Nature* assumed at the Incarnation; and that so we had an *Existent Mediator* from the time of the Fall. But whatever conveniences this Opinion may seem to have, I find no satisfactory proof of it in Scripture, nor that the Christian Church did ever hold it. And it is overmuch boldness to take up so great a Doctrine as a *third Nature* in Christ, which the Church of Christ was never acquainted with. And the Texts that seem to be for it, are capable of the common Exposition.

§. 6. If any think that this was the Judgment of abundance, yea, the most of the Antient Writers, before the days of *Arius*, because they have such unhappy expressions of Christ, which the Reader may find truly Collected to his hand by *Petavius de Trinitate*, and that it is fitter to Expound them as speaking only of *Christ's second Nature*, than to account them *all Arians*, or to honour the *Arians* by making them *on their side*, I answer, I leave every Man to his own judgment upon perusal of the Fathers words, allowing all Charity that hath sufficient ground: But I cannot perceive, that these Writers talk of any more Natures in Christ than two, and pious ends must be served by no Fictions and Untruths: I think that we must rather gather with *Petavius* there that the Votes in the *Nicene Council* tell us, that

then the greater part of the Church were against *Arian*, and therefore they were so before, because they held (in so great a point) the Faith which they had received from their Fathers. And that the greater part of Writers, might differ from the greater part of the Church. And withal, these Writers having more than other men to do with the Heathen Philosophers and Orators, who were prejudiced against the Doctrine of the Trinity, did shun their Offence by too much stretching their speeches to that which they thought they could easier digest, which gave *Arian* his advantages. The Conclusions either way are harsh and sad; but I leave others better to avoid them.

§. 7. The Deity it self may not unfitly be called our REDEEMER before the Incarnation, though not so fitly a MEDIATOR, and though Redemption by Christ's Death and Merits in the *Flesh* was not then wrought: Because the word *Redeming* is oft taken for a *merciful Delivering*, though without a price; and also because the Price was promised from the beginning. But thus the word REDEEMER is equivocal, signifying either the Deity as a *promising*, undertaking Saviour, or the Mediator who was promised, and who performed the undertaken means.

§. 8. The MEDIATOR himself being purely the Gift of the Divine Love and Mercy, it was no inconvenience, that God then had all the Glory, and that Faith then acknowledged no other existent Saviour, but God himself the Infinite Good.

§. 9. It troubleth men much to open, how Christ was any true Cause of our Pardon and Salvation as a Mediator, before his Incarnation? And what his merits, sacrifice and intercession could do, before they did exist? And the common Answer is, That *Moral* (though not *Physical*) Causes may cause before they exist, and so operate as foreseen, foredecreed or willed. But these Logical notions must not be used to put off the Question, instead of satisfactorily answering it. This tells us not whether by a *Moral Cause* they mean a *True Cause* of some moral Being, or something morally called a *Cause* which indeed is not so, but *quasi causa*: Nor yet whether they mean a *Cause efficient, final or constitutive*: Nor yet whether they mean a Cause of any thing in God, or only of some following effect.

§. 10. It must be concluded that Christ's *merits, sacrifice and Intercession* make no real Change in God, his *Understanding or Will*, and therefore have no such Causality.

§. 11. But God's *Promise first*, and Christ's *Merits and Sacrifice next* make a Change in the state of things, laying that *Ground-work or necessary Antecedent and Condition*, upon which it becometh meet, right and just for God to give the rest of his mercy which this is the Condition of, and the true meritorious Cause: And so the Change was neither on G O D, nor immediately on Man, but for Man on the state of things which God and man were both concerned in: It is a *causa ordinis*, while that is done first, which is prerequisite to what is to follow: And it is a *causa rei (beneficii)* while it not only removeth moral Impediments of our Pardon and Salvation, but also setteth matters in

such a state, in which it becometh *congruous, meet, right and just* for God to pardon and save us; which is a remote disposing the fall'n sinner to be a *due Recipient* of God's following promised Grace. And thus it is in both senses a *moral Cause*, as it is a Cause of our *Right*, and of *Congruity*, and as it is, though not indeed, yet *morally, reputatively, or Quasi causa physica realis*, of our *Pardon, Grace and Salvation*, by making them become just, right and due. And being thus far a Cause of the effects *ad extra, per extrinsecam denominationem ex commutatione & relatione ad objectum*, it may be called (with cautelous sobriety) a Cause of God's own *Intellections and Volitions*: For though in themselves they are God's Essence, yet for God [*to know us to be redeemed and to will our present Pardon and Salvation as Redeemed ones,*] are words that speak more than God's Essence as in it self, and include the termination of his Acts on these Objects as such; and so denominate God's Essence distinctly from the Objects, which else would never be distinguished, nor have but one name; being really but one.

§. 12. Yet all these diversifying, distinguishing, denominating Causes of God's Intellections, Volitions and Operations, must not (even denominatively or relatively) be counted or called *Efficient Causes* of God's Acts, nor *strictly final* but *objective*. And therefore here it must be considered *what Cause an Object is*, which Philosophers are not well agreed in. But I think I may safely say, That as to *moral acts*, the Object is to be reduced to such a *causa materialis* or *constitutiva* as they are capable of, not of the Act as an Act, but as *this act*, in specie, denominated from the receptive terminating mat-

ter or object. And though to *Man*, to know this or that, and to will this or that *ad extra*, seem somewhat really different (or modally at least) from knowing and willing our selves or some other Object, yet in God it is not to be called *ex parte sui*, a real or modal difference at all.

§. 13. Yet I assert not that the *Ratio prima* of all these *Diversities* of the Divine Acts is *ex terminis seu recipientibus* : For the first Reason is in and of God himself : For it is God that maketh all diversities of Effects and Changes ; and so it is from those divers Effects of his own Will, that his Will is relatively *ex connotatione termini* diversly denominated. But that in God which is the *Ratio prima diversitatis*, is not divers, but his one simple essential Will ; so that it is the diversity of Objects which is the immediate Reason of distinguishing God's acts, (of which before).

§. 14. These things premised, I come nearer to the Question ; if that which existeth not do truly cause, it must be either efficiently, constitutively, or finally. The two first are denied by the common Reason of Mankind. That which is not, cannot effect : Nothing can do nothing. And to say it is not, is to say, it constituteth not. And as it is certain, that *causa finalis non efficit*, yea, is but *causa metaphorice operans*, so it is certain, that no Creature causeth any thing in God, no not finally.

§. 15. Those that say, That Christ and his death and merits did not cause before Existence, in *esse existenti*, but in *esse cognito*, as constituting the Divine Idea's, 1. Must remember that the *esse cognitum*, as they call it, is no *esse rei cognita* at all ; Therefore if only the *esse cognitum* do cause, then
it

it was not Christ and his Merits that caused
 2. In Man for an esse cognitum, to cause his further
 acts, is but for one Thought to cause another Thought,
 or a Volition or Negation. And these Thoughts and
 Volitions are really divers, and constituted by re-
 ception of intromitted Objects: But God is no
 Recipient, nor knoweth any Object as we do by
 intromission; Nor hath he any such Thoughts or
 Ideals of Creatures as are really divers *ex parte*
Dei, but only by extrinsick denomination.

S. 16. If it be said, That then God should know
 nothing till it is, because a denomination must be
 from something, and nothing can be no Object or
terminus; and so of his Will. I Ans. 1. God doth
 not know any thing as *existent now*, which doth
 not exist now. But our *Now* is in his *Eternity*, and
 his *Eternity* without partition comprehendeth all
 our *Times*; *pre* and *post*, *ab* and *ad* are Prepositions
 of no signification in and of *Eternity*; but only
 [In]. And therefore as *Augustine* saith, his *Pro-*
science is but his *Science* so denominated from the
 Order of Objects, but noteth not any difference in
 him, who hath neither *pre* nor *post*. How this is
 to be understood without making the Creature
 eternally exist, I have elsewhere fully opened.

S. 17. That plain truth therefore which must
 here satisfie us is, That God, who is the first
 efficient and ultimate final Cause of all things, and
 caused by none, did of his free abundant Mercy
 undertake the saving of sinful Man, and not-
 withstanding his Threatning and Man's Defect, re-
 solving to make advantage of our Sin and Mise-
 ry, for the Glory of his Wisdom, Love, Mercy
 and Justice, he promised that the Eternal Word
 should in due time assume Man's nature, and there-
 in

in do and suffer that which should glorifie him more than Man's Perdition would have done, and which should make it just and meet for him to save the Guilty, both inceptively at the present under the Promise (for 4000 years) and afterward more fully at Christ's Incarnation, and finally to perfect all in Glory.

So that the Work of our Salvation is one entire frame, composed by Divine Wisdom and Love; where one part is the Reason of another, though none be the Cause of any thing in God: And Christ's Mediation, though coming after 4000 years, yet was then to do that which should make it meet and right and just for God to pardon Sin before: Even as in a Building the several parts may be the reason of each other, because they must be all compaginated and fitted to their relative places and uses: And though the Foundation make not the Superstructure, it upholdeth it: And as *Aquinas* briefly saith, *Deus non propter hoc vult hoc, sed vult hoc esse propter hoc*; nothing is the Cause of God's Will, but it is God's Will that one thing shall be for another: And when all his Work must be one Frame, the part last made may be a reason of the former. And so Christ's merits and sacrifice, though after 4000 years, perform that for which it became just and meet before for God to pardon Sinners. For though it was not then existent, yet (besides the Decree) the Promise, Prediction and Publication made it useful to its ends, in respect to G O D and Man.

§ 18. So then, though the Cause be not truly a Cause till it exist, and though all the Pardon and Salvation given for 4000 years, was before the
existence

existence of the merits and sacrifice of Christ, yet the *Promise* and *Notification* of the Mediator and his merits and sacrifice, as the reason of this Pardon, did then exist, and was the cause of that Pardon, which Christ was afterward to merit.

§. 19. It is therefore no absurdity, that the existence of *Man's Faith* and *Repentance* should be necessary, when the *Mediator's Existence* and his *Merits* was not necessary: For it was not then an existent Mediator (and Sacrifice, &c.) that was the Object of Faith, but only a *Promised Mediator*.

§. 20. And whereas it is a doubt, seeing the *Head* is essential to the Church, and the *Divine Nature* only was Head of the Church before the Incarnation, and the *Divine* and *Humane* united was afterward the Head, whether it follow not the Church before the Incarnation and after (and so Faith and Religion) were divers in *specie*, and not the same? I answer, That while we agree all *de re*, that so much difference there is, it is not worth our trouble to strive about the Name or Logical Notion of [*Sameness of Species*.]

§. 21. When God hath chosen to save Man by way of a Mediator, and by his Sacrifice and Merits, as that way in which his Wisdom, Love, Holiness, Mercy and Justice are eminently glorified, it seemeth to me too bold Presumption to dispute, *Whether he could not have saved us otherwise*, and pardoned Sin without a Saviour? as it would be to dispute, *Whether he could not illuminate the Earth without the Sun?* He wanteth not Power to do whatsoever is meet for God to do; but all the question is, *Whether it be meet, supposing Man's Nature and Sin to be what they are?*

§. 22. God

§. 22. God did illuminate the World without the Sun, till the Sun was made : But it was the *imperfect World*, and before the perfecting of his Work : And so God did save Man without an *Existent Mediator*, (unless God may be called a *Mediator* between himself and us, which is a harsh Phrase). But it was before the Work of our Salvation was brought to *maturity* ; for the Cure of Man is perfectest at last.

§. 23. We must take great heed, that in considering of the parts of our Redemption by Christ, we look not all at *one* and over-look the rest, nor set not those Works of Christ in opposition which must be taken in conjunction : But his Incarnation, Obedience, Contempt of the World, Victory over Satan, Suffering, Resurrection, Ascension, Glory, Intercession, Reign, Raising the Dead, Judgment, glorifying his Church, must be all conjoined, though not confounded.

§. 24. The Benefits of Redemption, or recovering Mercies, are not all given in the same way : We must carefully distinguish of those that God giveth *absolutely* and *antecedently* ; that is, before any Condition or Duty on Man's part, and those that he giveth *consequently* upon Man's Duty performed as the means of Reception.

§. 25. *Antecedent* Mercies are some common to all men, and some proper to some Countries, Ages and Persons, as the *free Benefactor* pleaseth.

§. 26. Of the former sort is the *Sustentation of Nature*, *reprival* from deserved miseries, the *Law of Grace*, as to the tenor, and some degree of promulgation, with all the common Mercies, Means, Duties which tend to Recovery. Of the later sort are the *greater degrees* of such mercies and means, which

As it is a *Covenant* it containeth, 1. The *Benefit* (which is the *Reward*) freely given, yet on condition of a *due and suitable Reception* and use of *prescribed Means*: 2. The *Condition* described, and *Means* prescribed, in the said *Preceptive* part. 3. And the *Threatning* in case of *Ingratitude, Refusal* and *Disobedience*. Which are the same things as in the *Law of Grace*, considering the

And where Diabon is taken for a Testament, the Parts and Acts are the same with the Relation of it to the Death of the Testator, who as his last Will, giveth such gifts on such Terms. And Christ did put his Commands unto his Testament, John 14, & 15, & 16.

Covenant but as *Instituted* and *Offered*: For *Diabon* signifieth usually but the *Resolved* declared terms of *Life and Death*, or the *Divine Ordination* by which he will *Rule and Judge* us. And so it is oft called a *Covenant* before *Consent* by *Man*, which maketh it to be *συμβολή* a *Mutual Contract*. And even a *Law* as *Received* by a *voluntary subject* is *Consented* to, and becometh a *Contract*. If any think that I give not the true difference of *God's Laws* and *Covenants*, let him tell me more, and

I suppose we shall agree *de re*, though not *de ratione nominis*: And let it now suffice to tell you how I would be understood my self: Though the word *Law* be some time taken more narrowly, and the word *Covenant* oft for *Mutual Contract* (which is but a *Law consented to*) yet being to speak of each term as signifying that *Regulating Frame* by which *God Ruleth* us and will *Judge* us, and by which he giveth us his *Gifts* and *Rewards*, I mean the same thing, in several respects called by the several names; The *absolute Antecedent Gifts* of our *Great Benefactor* being supposed inclusively in both.

S E C T. I.

Of the Law or Covenant of Innocency made to Adam.

§. 1. **I** Shall in this order Treat briefly of the Divine Laws. I. Of the Law of Innocency to *Adam*. II. Of the Law of *Mediation* to *Christ*. III. Of the Law of Grace to fallen Man. And there, 1. As in the first Edition to *Adam* and *Noah*: 2. As in the same Edition joined with the Jewish Law of *Peculiarly* to *Abraham*, and of Works by *Moses* to *Abraham's* Seed. 3. Of the Law of Graces as in the second Edition by *Christ*:

§. 2. 1. The *Law of Innocency* contained a *Precept* and *Prohibition*, and a *Retributive* part to which *Adam* was bound to be a *Voluntary Subject*, and therefore to *Consent* (which will allow it the name of a *Covenant*.) But here the brief Narrative in the Scripture calleth to us to distinguish of things certain, and things uncertain (whoever assert them.)

§. 3. 1. The *Preceptive* part was revealed by *Nature*, or *Supernaturally* (by *Voice*, or *Inspiration*, or *Vision*, &c.) The former being *Lex natura integra*, the *Law of Intire Nature*, though the Chief is least spoken of in *Gen.* because it is supposed legible in *Nature* it self.

§. 4. The *Law of Nature*, properly so called, is in esse *Objectivo*, that signification of *God's Will* concerning *Man's Duty*, which was discernible in the *Universa rerum Natura* in all *God's Works*; but principally in *Mans own Nature*, as related to *God* and all *Persons*, and *Things* about him.

existence of the merits and sacrifice of Christ, yet the *Promise* and *Notification* of the Mediator and his merits and sacrifice, as the reason of this Pardon, did then exist, and was the cause of that Pardon, which Christ was afterward to merit.

§. 19. It is therefore no absurdity, that the existence of *Man's Faith* and *Repentance* should be necessary, when the *Mediator's Existence* and his *Merits* was not necessary: For it was not then an *existent Mediator* (and *Sacrifice*, &c.) that was the Object of Faith, but only a *Promised Mediator*.

§. 20. And whereas it is a doubt, seeing the *Head* is essential to the Church, and the *Divine Nature* only was *Head* of the Church before the Incarnation, and the *Divine* and *Humane* united was afterward the Head, whether it follow not the Church before the Incarnation and after (and so Faith and Religion) were divers in *specie*, and not the same? I answer, That while we agree all *de re*, that so much difference there is, it is not worth our trouble to strive about the Name or Logical Notion of [*Sameness of Species*.]

§. 21. When God hath chosen to save Man by way of a Mediator, and by his Sacrifice and Merits, as that way in which his Wisdom, Love, Holiness, Mercy and Justice are eminently glorified, it seemeth to me too bold Presumption to dispute, *Whether he could not have saved us otherwise*, and pardoned Sin without a Saviour? as it would be to dispute, *Whether he could not illuminate the Earth without the Sun?* He wanteth not Power to do whatsoever is meet for God to do; but all the question is, *Whether it be meet, supposing Man's Nature and Sin to be what they are?*

§. 22. God

§. 22. God did illuminate the World without the Sun, till the Sun was made : But it was the *imperfect World*, and before the perfecting of his Work : And so God did save Man without an *Existent Mediator*, (unless God may be called a *Mediator* between himself and us, which is a harsh Phrase). But it was before the Work of our Salvation was brought to *maturity* ; for the Cure of Man is perfectest at last.

§. 23. We must take great heed, that in considering of the parts of our Redemption by Christ, we look not all at *one* and over-look the rest, nor set not those Works of Christ in opposition which must be taken in conjunction : But his Incarnation, Obedience, Contempt of the World, Victory over Satan, Suffering, Resurrection, Ascension, Glory, Intercession, Reign, Raising the Dead, Judgment, glorifying his Church, must be all conjoined, though not confounded.

§. 24. The Benefits of Redemption, or recovering Mercies, are not all given in the same way : We must carefully distinguish of those that God giveth *absolutely* and *antecedently* ; that is, before any *Condition* or *Duty* on *Man's* part, and those that he giveth *consequently* upon *Man's Duty performed* as the means of Reception.

§. 25. *Antecedent* Mercies are some common to all men, and some proper to some Countries, Ages and Persons, as the *free Benefactor* pleaseth.

§. 26. Of the former sort is the *Sustentation of Nature*, *reprival* from deserved miseries, the *Law of Grace*, as to the tenor, and some degree of promulgation, with all the common Mercies, Means, Duties which tend to Recovery. Of the later sort are the *greater degrees* of such mercies and means, which

which God freely giveth to some more than others.

§. 27. Therefore we must not say that Infidels or wicked men have no Mercies, or no Right to what they do possess as from God, as being no *Consenters* to the Covenant or Performers of it. Because there are *Antecedent Mercies* given before such Consent or Performance; not as to Covenanters but as to miserable men, invited to enter Covenant with God in Christ. Though these are so forfeited by their refusal, that they have no assurance of their continuance, but God may soon take them all away.

§. 28. The consequent Mercies are Pardon, Justification, Adoption, the Spirit, a secured filial Right to all outward Mercies that are good and suitable to us, and final Glory, and whatever God hath promised on Conditions by us to be performed.

§. 29. The question of *universal Redemption* and *special*, I shall pretermitt till I speak of *universal Grace*.

§. 30. Seeing Life, Health, Food, Hope, and all that is truly good, were forfeited by Sin, and none of them can be due to us by the *Law of Innocency*, it followeth, that wherever they are given, it is upon other terms, which can be no other than those of the *Law of Grace*, as fruits of our Redeemer's Mercy (*antecedently or consequently.*) And where the *Fruits* are apparent, we may know the Cause.

§. 31. The *Fruits of Redemption* are one entire frame consisting of various and unequal parts, to divers persons (yet mutually related :) And therefore it will not follow, that nothing but what certainly inferreth the person's *Salvation* is any such effect of Man's Redemption,

CHAP.

C H A P. XII.

Of the several Laws or Covenants of God.

§. 1. **T**Hough the order of the matter require, that I should have spoken of the Law of Innocency before I had spoken of Sin and Redemption, yet thinking that the sort of Readers for whom I now especially write, will best understand things, if I treat of all God's Laws together, I will at this time fetch my method from their intended benefit.

§. 2. The nature of a Law in general, and of God's Laws in special, I have elsewhere so oft and largely spoken of (pretending somewhat to clear up that Doctrine from several mistakes) that I must here pretermitt it.

§. 3. Though the word [Law] do principally signifie the regulating Imposition of our Duty, and the word *Covenant* doth principally signifie a mutual Contract; yet it is the same Divine Instrument, which is meant oft and usually in Scripture, by both these Names: (Of which see *Grotius* at large in his Preface to his Annotations in *Nov. Testam.*) It is called a Law in one respect, and a Covenant in another, but the thing is the same.

As a Law, the parts of it are, 1. The Precept (and Prohibition) constituting our Duty. 2. The Retribution, Premitive and Penal constituting the Duety of Rewards and Punishments, as the duty is performed or neglected.

As it is a *Covenant* it containeth, 1. The *Benefit* (which is the *Reward*) freely given, yet on condition of a *due and suitable Reception and use of prescribed Means*: 2. The *Condition described*, and *Means prescribed*, in the said *Preceptive part*. 3. And the *Threatning* in case of *Ingratitude, Refusal and Disobedience*. Which are the same things as in the *Law of Grace*, considering the

And where Diabon is taken for a Testament, the Parts and Acts are the same with the Relation of it to the Death of the Testator, who as his last Will, giveth such gifts on such Terms. And Christ did put his Commands unto his Testament, John 14, & 15, & 16.

Covenant but as *Instituted and Offered*: For *Diabon* signifieth usually but the *Resolved declared terms of Life and Death*, or the *Divine Ordination* by which he will *Rule and Judge us*. And so it is oft called a *Covenant before Consent by Man*, which maketh it to be *συμβολή* a *Mutual Contract*. And even a *Law* as *Received by a voluntary subject is Consented to*, and becometh a *Contract*. If any think that I give not the true difference of God's *Laws and Covenants*, let him tell me more, and

I suppose we shall agree *de re*, though not *de ratione nominis*: And let it now suffice to tell you how I would be understood my self: Though the word *Law* be some time taken more narrowly, and the word *Covenant* oft for *Mutual Contract* (which is but a *Law consented to*) yet being to speak of each term as signifying that *Regulating Frame* by which God *Ruleth us and will Judge us*, and by which he giveth us his *Gifts and Rewards*, I mean the same thing, in several respects called by the several names; The *absolute Antecedent Gifts* of our Great *Benefactor* being supposed inclusively in both.

S E C T. I.

Of the Law or Covenant of Innocency made to Adam.

§. 1. **I** Shall in this order Treat briefly of the Divine Laws. I. Of the Law of Innocency to *Adam*. II. Of the Law of *Mediation* to *Christ*. III. Of the Law of Grace to fallen Man. And there, 1. As in the first Edition to *Adam* and *Noah*: 2. As in the same Edition joined with the Jewish Law of *Peculiarly* to *Abraham*, and of Works by *Moses* to *Abraham's Seed*. 3. Of the Law of Graces as in the second Edition by *Christ*:

§. 2. 1. The Law of Innocency contained a Precept and Prohibition, and a Retributive part to which *Adam* was bound to be a Voluntary Subject, and therefore to Consent (which will allow it the name of a Covenant.) But here the brief Narrative in the Scripture calleth to us to distinguish of things certain, and things uncertain (whoever assert them.)

§. 3. 1. The Preceptive part was revealed by Nature, or Supernaturally (by Voice, or Inspiration, or Vision, &c.) The former being *Lex naturalis integra*, the Law of Intire Nature, though the Chief is least spoken of in *Gen.* because it is supposed legible in Nature it self.

§. 4. The Law of Nature, properly so called, is in esse Objectivo, that signification of God's Will concerning Man's Duty, which was discernible in the *Universa rerum Natura* in all God's Works; but principally in Mans own Nature, as related to God and all Persons, and Things about him.

§. 5. But *Improperly* or *Metonymically* so called, the Law of Nature is *in esse subjective* the *Communes notitia*, which Man had and was to have from the said *Objective* Law of Nature. But properly this is rather the *Knowledge* of the Law, than the *Law it self*, being not perfect in Adam himself at first, but was to be perfected as he came to know more and more of the Works of God, and varying much now in several Persons. Yet may it well be called *God's Law written in the Heart*, when we have the *Knowledge* and *Love* of his primary proper Law.

§. 6. This Law of Nature bound Adam to perfect *Devotedness* to God as his *Owner*, and perfect *gratitude* to God as his *Antecedent Benefactor*, and to perfect *Obedience* to God as his *Ruler*, and to perfect *Love* to God as his *ultimate most amiable End*. And this perfect *Obedience* was to be perpetual.

§. 7. It was Adam personally that the Law bound to this perfect perpetual *Obedience*, and not another for him, or that he should obey by a *Representative*, or a *Delegate*, a *Servant*, or by any other.

§. 8. Nature, even in its depraved state, now telleth us, that all Sin against God *deserveth Punishment*; Therefore the Law of Nature had a *Penal part*.

§. 9. It is a great doubt with many Divines whether the Law of Nature had any *premiant part* or *promise*, and so was a *Covenant*; because, say they, *Duty obligeth not God to reward us*. But it seemeth to me as far past doubt as the *penal part*. For the question is not, what our Duty performed obligeth God to, much less in point of *Commutative Justice*, where no Creature can Merit of God,

Job

Job 35. 6, 7, 8. If thou be Righteous, what givest thou him, &c. But it is presupposed that God first became Man's Benefactor and his Ruler, and his Law is the Instrument of his Government; and his Promise is but the signification of his Will, what he will give, and on what Terms: And God in Nature signified his Will to bless the Obedient, and love those that love him; For as a Ruler he is Just; and if he differenced not the Righteous from the Sinner, what were his Justice? Were there no other Reward, but the Continuance of the Paradise-Blessing freely given him (which Sin would forfeit) it would have been a great Reward: And if God equally take away his Gifts from Good and Bad, it is not Governing Justice, though as the Act of a Proprietor it be neither Just nor Unjust, so that the very essence of Undertaken Government, containeth a discovery of God's Rewarding Will; which is the promissory or premiant part of the Law of Nature.

§. 10. The Degree and Kind of the Natural Reward, must be gathered, 1. From the state that Man was in. 2. From the nature of his Duty. 3. From the state of Perfection which his Nature was made inclined to desire and seek.

§. 11. 1. Man being freely placed in the state of Innocency and God's Favour in the Earthly Pleasures of Eden, as a Sanctified state of Communion with God, seeing Sin was to be punished with the privation of these, we may gather, that the Innocent should not have been deprived of them.

§. 12. 2. Man's great Duty being to Love God perfectly (according to his present Ability) and to please him, and delight herein, we may gather,

that the *Innocent* should have the felicity which is herein contained, even in the *Delights* of loving and pleasing God.

§. 13. 3. Man's Nature being not made in its *utmost perfection*, but *in via*, with a desire of knowing God, loving him, pleasing him, and delighting in him yet more, according to his Capacity, we may gather, That obedient Man should have attained *that Perfection* : For God maketh not the capacities, dispositions and desires of Nature in vain.

§. 14. But whether all this should have been given on *Earth* or in *Heaven*, is not so clear in Nature or Scripture : But, 1. The Translation of *Henoch* and *Elias* maketh it probable, that so Man should have been translated. 2. And so doth the *Glory* purchased by the Redeemer. 3. And the matter is the less, because where-ever the place be, the same state of *Enjoyment* would make it a *Heaven* to such a person.

§. 15. Neither doth Nature now tell us, *How long Man must have obeyed, before he had merited the full Reward of his Perfection*. But only that he must conquer all the Temptations that God would try him with, and must persevere till God should please to translate him, not appointing him any determinate time. Nature and Scripture favour this.

§. 16. There are some who confidently conclude (without either natural or Scripture-proof) That had *Adam* performed but one *Act of Obedience* to God, before his Sin, he had been confirmed as the *Angels*, as his Reward : And what a *Sinner* do they make *Adam* before he sinned, if he performed not one Act of Love and Obedience to his Maker ? This Fancy I dismiss.

§. 17. Others

§. 17. Others say, That if he had overcome *one Temptation* he should have been confirmed ; but I find no Promise or Proof of it in *Nature*, nor in *Scripture* ; and I suppose they feign not a *secret conditional Will* of God.

§. 18. Though it be agreed on by most Protestants, That *Adam* had been an Heir of *Death* and *Hell* if he committed the least Sin, even an idle thought or word, though he had not eaten the *forbidden Fruit*, and so that the Law of Nature made *Hell* the due punishment of the *least Sin*, and doth so still if it be not pardoned, yet the Law of Nature in our *lapsed State* is herein somewhat dark, and the *Scripture* not so clear for it as some imagine: But thus much methinks Nature it self still speaketh.

§. 19. 1. That the *least sin* deserveth some degree of Punishment. 2. That God hath various degrees of Punishment, suited to the degrees of Sin. 3. That the *least Sin* hath a tendency to more, and that still to more, till Man be utterly miserable. And that both in its own *Nature*, and in the forfeiture of some measure of *God's Grace* or Help. 4. That if you suppose that *vain thought* or word to consist still with *true Love to God*, God could not immediately hate and damn that Soul that so loved him. But if that Person perish, it must be by that idle thought or word producing worse, till it had turned his love from God to the Creature. 5. That antecedently to Gods undertaking to be the Ruler of Man, no doubt but as an absolute Owner, he might have taken away all that he gave him, even his *Life and Being*, without any fault in Man: for he may do as he list with his own; And therefore he might have done the

same for the smallest *fault*, which he might have done without it. And therefore he might have inflicted any Pain, which to Man is not worse than Annihilation, for ever. But whether his three fore-mentioned Acts; 1. *Antecedently placing* Man as he did. 2. Making him *such Duty* as he made him. 3. And such *Inclination to better*, do not imply that God *would not* punish him unless he *sinned*, and then but according to the degree of his Sin, I leave to Consideration.

§. 20. But whether God *must*, and whether *he might*, punish the *least Sin with Hell*, are different questions: Whether by the Law of Nature *he must* do it or be *unjust*, and so a vain thought was not pardonable by or under that Law, and so Adam was an Heir of Hell when his thought first failed, before he did eat or *consent* to eat the forbidden Fruit, are questions which I cannot resolve from Nature, and are to me more difficult in Scripture than to wiser men.

§. 21. The *supernatural part* of the Law is known to us only by *Scripture*, but perhaps the Fathers before the Flood might know more of it by *Tradition*, than God hath thought meet to write for our times.

§. 22. The *preceptive part* was the *not eating* the forbidden Fruit, and consequently the overcoming all *Temptations* thereto: The Law of *Matrimony* and the *Sabbath* also, are partly *supernatural* (called *Positive*.)

§. 23. The Penalty is called *Death*, which signifieth *Undoing* and *Misery*: But whether it was only *temporal Death* or also *Hell*, Divines are not agreed. They that are for the *former*, seem chiefly drawn to it, by comparing the *Law* with the

Judg-

Judgment and *Execution*, thinking it indecent to say, that God fulfilled not his *Threatning*, but dispensed with it: And therefore seeing *Temporal Death* only is in the *Sentence* and *Execution*, they think that no more was meant: And consequently that Christ did not by *Redemption*, prevent the *sentence* and *execution* of that *Death*, but only when it was fulfilled, deliver us from *continuance* under it by a *Resurrection*.

§. 24. But I would have such remember, 1. That the Soul was made *naturally immortal*, that is, not tending to *Annihilation*, unless God should against Nature or settled Course annihilate it. And if it were not annihilated, it must be in some state, good or bad. If it was to be *penally annihilated*, Christ prevented that: And such an *annihilation* is as little desirable as a *tolerable* degree of Pain. 2. And that God's Law determining directly but *de debito pœna*, what should be *Man's due*, and not *absolutely* and *peremptorily* then *de eventu*, God reserved to himself a *pardoning Power*, so it were done upon *valuable Considerations*, more fully glorifying him and his Government and Law, than *Man's Destruction* would have done. And thus to dispense with his Law is no dishonour to God.

§. 25. It is the *Wrath* to come that Christ delivereth us from, and *Hell* and the *Power of Satan* that he redeemed us from: Therefore it seemeth that it was no less that our Sin deserved. And *spiritual death* is contained in *Sin* and *Apostacy* it self.

§. 26. What the *Reward* was to be, besides what I said before from *Nature*, it is not easie to gather out of *Scripture*, nor to find there any plainer a *Promise of Life*; but in both I think it is certainly implied.

§. 27. It is ordinary to say, That the Condition of Adam's Confirmation was, That he should have eaten first of the Tree of Life : But to find that among the Commands, much less the Condition with a Promise of Confirmation, requireth more discerning than I have ; notwithstanding the words [*Lest he eat and live, &c.*] from which they gather it.

§. 28. How far this Law is yet in force, is also difficultly disputed. In brief, 1. The general Command of perfect Love and Obedience for the future, and the Commands of the unalterable Duties of Nature, are still so far in force as to oblige us. 2. But whether *sub pœna mortis* is the doubt ? Punishment is due either absolutely and statedly, and so it maketh it due only to the Impenitent and Unbelievers. Or only in *primo instanti*, inceptively, with an annexed Remedy : And so every Sin maketh Punishment so far due to the Faithful, as that they have need of the Grace of Christ, and the new Covenant to pardon it. 3. But the premiant part of the Law of Innocency, from whence it is named a Covenant, is now truly null. Which maketh our Divines say, That the Law of Nature (which they call moral) bindeth as a Rule of Duty, but the Covenant ceaseth.

§. 29. This was not done by GOD but Man, who ceased to be a capable Subject of that Covenant, Promise or Reward : And so the Condition (Innocency or perfect Obedience) being become naturally impossible, we must not feign God to say to Sinners [*On condition you be no Sinners you shall live*]. But *Cessante capacitate subditi cessat promissio conditionalis, & transit in sententiam.*

But of the Cessation of the Law and Covenant of Innocency, see more after Sect. 5, §. 32, &c.

§. 30. They

§. 30. They pervert this Covenant by their unproved Fictions, who say, that the sence of it was [*Thou, or one for thee, shall obey, and if thou Sin, thou or Christ shall suffer.*] And so that we are justified by this *same Covenant* which condemneth us, as having been innocent and perfectly righteous (habitually and actually) in and by Christ.

S E C T. II.

*Of the Law of Mediation or Covenant with
CHRIST.*

§. 1. **A**S the *Mediator* in *Person* and *Office*, differed from all other Creatures, so he was under a *Law* and *Covenant*, proper to himself.

§. 2. This *Law* and *Covenant* was made to and with *Christ* incarnate: For so he was a *Subject* under *Law*. It is too bold, improper and offensive a Phrase to call God's *eternal Decree* of Redemption by the Name of a *Law*, yea, or a *Covenant* of God with Himself, that is, of the Father with the Son.

§. 3. Therefore all the Descriptions of it in the *Old Testament*, are but Prophecies and Promises containing the terms of the *future Covenant*; (as we call a *form of Prayer*, a *Prayer*, though it be but matter fitted to be a Prayer when it hath the formal act.) But *Christ* had truly a *Law* and *Promises*.

§. 4. The *Preceptive* or imposed part was, in general, that he do the *Office* of a *Mediator*: particularly, 1. That habitually and actually he perfectly fulfill all the *Law of Nature*, which he was capable

pable of. 2. That he fulfill also the Law of *Moses*. 3. That he also do those things proper to the *Mediator*, in his *Miracles*, *Sacrifice*, *Resurrection*, *Intercession*, *Teaching*, *Government*, &c. which he undertook.

§. 5. Christ took the *Nature* of *Man*, but not strictly the *Real* or *Reputative Person* of any man, but *himself*, much less of every *Man* or every *Believer*: I mean, that *his Person* was not the *natural Person* of any other, nor *esteemed of God* so to be; nor yet was he the full and proper *Representative* or *Civil Person* of any man, much less of *a'l men*; that is, One that the *Law* allowed us to do and suffer by, so that in *Law-sence* his doing and suffering should be *reputed ours*; as a man payeth a Debt by his *Servant* or *Substitute*; which is morally or reputatively his *Act* and *Deed*, or accepted in the same sort and to all the same effects and purposes, as if he had paid it with his own hands. The *person* of the *Mediator* was not in *Law-sence*, nor God's account, nor Christ's undertaking the *person* of the *Sinner himself*.

§. 6. Else Christ should have been in God's account a *Sinner*, and the *greatest Sinner* in the *World*, and *hated* as such by God above any other *Sinner*; which whoever shall affirm, shall speak presumptuously and blasphemously.

§. 7. Yea, else Christ should have been *many millions* of persons in *Law-sence*, and *many millions* of *Sinners*; which is not agreeable to God's Word.

§. 8. Christ neither *was a Sinner*, nor *reputed a Sinner* by God: And his being *made sin for us*, signifieth; 1. That *he was made a Sacrifice for Sin*, and was taken and used by God as one that undertook to *suffer for our sins*, in *our stead*, though not in
our

our person. 2. And that he was really accounted a Sinner by those that crucified him, and used as such.

§. 9. *First*, Christ did not fulfill the *Law of Innocency* in our *several persons*; He did not all those things *materially* that *Adam* was obliged to do; nor which most of us are obliged to do. We did not *reputatively* fulfill that Law by him, so as that his *Perfection* is taken as *ours*, in *Habit* and in *Act*.

§. 10. *Secondly*, Christ did not fulfill the *Law of Moses* in the *person* of all them that were *never bound themselves* to fulfill it; so as that they are reputed *Fulfillers* of it in and by Christ: For since his *Ascension* it is *abrogated* even to the *Jews* themselves, and now bindeth none in the *World* (as *Mosaical*.)

§. 11. *Thirdly*, Christ did not work *Miracles*, *rise*, *ascend*, *intercede*, *reign*, *teach*, *give Laws*, and *Ministers*, and *Grace*, in the *Person* of every or any other, but only in his own *Person* as the great *Mediator* and *Saviour* of *Man*.

§. 12. If any will use the word [PERSON] in a private, narrow and improper sence, and say, That [*He who undertook in the person of a Mediator to obey and merit for our Justification, and to suffer in our stead to save us from deserved suffering, may therefore be called The Person of every one that he merited and suffered for, though I will not so presume to thrust Phrases on the Church which Scripture never used, when their obvious sence is pernicious, yet if that man will by Explication of the word PERSON (or REPRESENTATIVE) notifie to the World, that he taketh it in a sound sence,*

sence, I will not quarrel about an *unfit word*, while Religion is safe.

* John 12. 32.

John 7. 39. &

6. 60, 61, 62,

63, 54. Joh. 5.

22, 23, 24, 25.

Joh. 10. 2, 3,

4, 7, 8, 11, 14,

15, 16. & 2.

16, &c. Heb.

13. 20. Joh. 6.

33, 34, 35, 48,

51, 53, 63. &

8. 12, 13. & 10. 10. & 11. 25. & 14. 6, 7. & 20. 31. Rom. 5.

17, 18, 19, 20. & 8. 1, 2, 3. Col. 3. 3, 4. 2 Tim. 1. 1.

Tit. 1. 2. 2 Pet. 1. 3. Joh. 12. 25. & 17. 2, 3. Tit. 3. 5, 7.

1 Joh. 1. 2. & 2. 25. & 5. 11, 12, 13, 20. 1 Tim. 1. 16.

Joh. 4. 14. Gal. 6. 8.

§. 13. * Christ undertook not only to *merit* and *suffer* for Man, but also to *draw all men to him*, and to send forth his Spirit and Ministry, and to gather together the Elect of God that are scattered through the World, and to intercede for them, and to give them eternal life, having raised them up at the last day.

§. 14. The *premiant part* of the Law of Mediation, or the *Promise of God* in this Covenant to

† Mat. 28. 19.

Joh. 17. 1, 2, 3.

Rom. 14. 9, 10.

Eph. 1. 20, 23.

Phil. 2. 7, 9.

Joh. 5. 22.

Col. 1. Joh. 3.

16, 38.

Mat. 28. 20.

Eph. 4. 7, 8, &c.

Rom. 8. 9.

2 Tim. 1. 7.

Rom. 8. 1, to

28, 34. Heb. 7.

25. Rom. 8.

30, 35.

Christ, was, That *All Power* should be given him in † *Heaven and Earth*, and he should be *Lord both of the Dead and of the Living*, and *Head over all things to the Church*, and that he should be *glorified at God's right hand*, and have a *Name above every Name*, at which every *knee* should bow, and that *Principalities and Powers* should be *subject to him*. That he be authorized to give *Laws to the World*, (all *Judgment* being committed to him) and to make with Men a *Covenant of Grace and Life*, and send forth *Ministers to proclaim it*, and

the Spirit to effect the gathering of his Church; that his Intercession for them shall be accepted, and that he shall Judge all the World, and justifie and glorifie his Chosen according to the tenor of his Covenant of Grace: Which is all accordingly performed.

§. 15. Though if Christ as a Creature had sinned, he had deserved Punishment, yet the supposition being of a thing impossible, by reason of the Union of the Divine Nature, it is improper to talk of any penal part of the Law that was given him: For penal Laws are for those that have need by fear to be restrained from Sin, or constrained to Duty; which Christ needed not.

§. 16. Christ's entire Righteousness (as before his exaltation) habitual, active, passive, elevated by union with the Divine Perfection, was his performance of the Condition of his Covenant with the Father: And his performance of that Condition was his meritorious Title to God's promised Effects: And that as it was one entire Righteousness or Condition performed: And our Justification and Salvation are part of those promised Effects: Therefore it is abusive subtilty to divide Christ's Performance into little Parcels, and then say, *This Parcel is imputed to me for this use, and that for that use, and by one he merited this, and by the other that*, when (though each part of his Condition or Duty had its proper reason, yet) it was only the entire performance that was the Condition of the Benefits, and so of our Justification and Salvation.

§. 17. But I say, [before his Exaltation] because the Benefits being of several sorts, some of them were given upon Christ's merit presently, and some upon Man's believing, and some not till long after by application: But to all these, what Christ did

did only as *under the Law of Mediation*, was properly *his merit*, by which they were procured; But his [*undertaking*] *what he after did*, (in gathering his Church and interceding and ruling) may be numbered with the parts of his foreſaid *merit*; and *ſtill*, as a Creature, he is under his *Creator's Law*, even the Law of perfect uniting Love, and ſo doth eminently merit.

§. 18. It was neither the Covenant nor Will of the Father and Son, that we ſhould either have full poſſeſſion, deliverance, or right thereto, immediately upon Chriſt's Merit and Sacrifice (as we ſhould if we had done all by him as our Perſon): But that we and all things being delivered to Chriſt's Power and Will, he ſhould convey the Benefits of his Death and Merits, upon terms, and in an Order ſuitable to the intereſt of his Wiſdom, Love, Mercy, and Juſtice, even by a Law of Grace, and a Miniſtry and Means adapted to the end, and in the time and degrees which his Wiſdom ſhould make choice of: Which accordingly is done. This Covenant which giveth Right and Reward to Chriſt, is not it that giveth any Right or Reward to us.

S E C T. III.

Of the Law or Covenant of Grace in the firſt Edition.

§. 1. **A**S God delivered the *Law of Innocency* partly by *natural* and *real*, and partly by *ſupernatural* and *verbal* ſignifications of his will, ſo hath he done the *Law of Grace*; which is the
fig.

signification of his Will concerning Pardon and Life granted to guilty Sinners, and the terms thereof.

§. 2. The Promise, *Gen. 3. 15. The seed of the Woman shall break the Serpents head, &c.* was a *Breviate* of the *supernatural* signification; but it is not unlikely, that God did more fully acquaint them with his Law of Grace and Redemption, than those words alone could make us understand: Because we find in their sacrificing, some such intimation; (and in other signs.)

§. 3. God's *actual Continuance* of forfeited Life, Liberty, Health, and other comforts, and his *actual Collation* of many great *Mercies* by the course of *Nature*, to such as by Sin have deserved present Dampnation, is a *degree* of signification of his *pardonning will* and *mercy* by these natural signs: (which they were not *before sin* and *forfeiture*.)

§. 4. Man being after guilt of death, thus re-prieved and enriched with manifold Mercies, and his life and faculties continued with many instructing providential helps and means, the very Law of Nature now obligeth him to *love* and *thankfulness* to God that sheweth him so great kindness.

§. 5. And the same *Law of Nature* obligeth him to take *that God still* for a God of Love and Mercy, and to believe, that what Mercy he hath already shewed the World and us, is on terms which he knoweth to be very well consistent with his Holiness, Truth and Justice: And it obligeth us therefore to seek to him for Mercy, and to use all possible means for further hope and pardon and recovery, and not to sit down in despair.

§. 6. The *common sense* of all *Mankind* from *Adam* to this day, acquainteth us by that experience

rience, That these *Hopes* and *Duties* are found in the Law of *lapsed Nature* : For all the World that never heard the Gospel, do yet take God to be a *merciful, forgiving God*, and take themselves to be under some duty for the obtaining of further mercy, recovery and felicity.

§. 7. Though want of the sense of Sin, and its desert, and Man's misery may be thought by some to be the only cause of this, and so that it is but sinful presumption, and no part of Nature's obligation ; yet this upon trial will prove false. (Though what they alledge be *one part* of the Cause). For, 1. These men do acknowledge themselves Sinners, and to deserve punishment from God. 2. They find *some* misery and fear *more*. 3. It is not presumption to judge God to be merciful, when they and all the World do find him so. 4. It is not presumption to judge, that he *can* and *will* pardon Sin, when full Experience assureth us, that he hath *already* pardoned much. To remit the Sin, is (as we now speak of it) to remit the deserved punishment. And He that giveth Man forfeited life, health, time, and all the abundant Mercies which the World is full of, doth thereby so far actually forgive Sin : Saith Christ, *Whether is it easier to say thy sins be forgiven thee, or to say arise, take up thy Bed and walk*, that is, *Executively to forgive them*, which is the *full forgiveness*, by taking away the punishment. 5. It is no presumption to believe such Duty to be incumbent on us, as the remaining Law of Nature doth oblige us to. 6. Nor yet to take God's own Encouragements to seek our own recovery and felicity.

§. 8. The *Light* and *Law* of *lapsed Nature* doth convince men of the duty of *repenting* and *returning* to God, and oblige them to it. So that as *Perfect Obedience* was the duty of *entire Nature*, so *Repentance* is the duty of *lapsed Nature*: And I think few will say that all men are not hereby obliged to repent, and that in hope of mercy.

§. 9. Hence it is that it is found among the *Communes notitia*, and all the World as well as Christians acknowledge it and plead for it.

§. 10. They that by God's Patience and Mercy are *invited to Repentance*, which is a return from sin to God, and are by Nature obliged to it, ought to believe that it is not made their Duty in *vain*, nor shall they lose by it if they perform it; for that were to accuse God of making Mans Duty in vain, or to his loss, which is not to be suspected.

§. 11. Therefore they are bound not to *despair* of *Pardon* and *Salvation*; for an obligation to *use means as tending to recovery*, is inconsistent with an obligation to *despair*. Therefore *hope of Mercy* and *use of some means* Mankind is obliged to by the *Law of lapsed Nature*.

§. 12. This is not the obligation of the *Law* or *Covenant of Innocency*; for that *Law* bound us only as *Innocent* to keep our *Innocency* and perfectly therein obey: But it giveth *no pardon*, nor appointeth Man any Duty in order to *pardon* and *recovery*: Whatever doth this, is a *Law of Grace*.

§. 13. The sum of that Duty which the *Law of Nature* now obligeth Man to, is, To *consider* of all the *Mercies* which God vouchsafeth *Sinners*, and *thankfully to improve them*; to *repent of sin*, and *turn to this God*, who sheweth himself a *merciful*

Pardoning God; To resign themselves to him as their Owner, to obey him as their Ruler, and to love and seek him as their ultimate End; and to believe that his Mercy will not let us be losers in so doing, nor to do it in vain.

§. 14. But the *Supernatural Revelation* telleth us much more than all this, *Of the promised Seed, the means of our Salvation, and of our Duty in believing them, and of the Certainty and Nature of the Pardon, Deliverance, and Blessedness which we shall attain.*

§. 15. The *Preceptive part* at first was not to Believe as much of Christ, as is necessary since his *Ascension*; but to Believe what God *promised and revealed* of him to the Church at that time.

§. 16. Even under the Old Testament, God *increased his Revelation* of the *Messiah gradually*: The *Prophets* spake plainlier of him, than any thing written before. Therefore a more *extensive and distinct belief*, was needful in *one Age* than in a former.

§. 17. Yet, even the *Apostles* were in a state of *Salvation*, before they *understood and believed*, that Christ must *Die for Sin, rise again, Ascend and Intercede in Heaven* for his Elect.

§. 18. Yet all this was partly revealed before by the *Prophets*, and plainly foretold them by Christ himself: Therefore it was not of absolute necessity to *Salvation then*, to believe all of Christ which had been before Revealed, though it was a duty to them that knew it.

§. 19. Therefore under the *Covenant of Grace*, the *Condition of our right*, is narrower than the *Duty* which we are commanded to perform.

§. 20. The *Promised Benefits* (presupposing the

Com-

Common Antecedent Mercies) were Summarily, *Christ and Life in him*: That is, that for the sake of Christ's future Merits we should have Pardon, Justification, Reconciliation with God, Adoption, Sanctification and Glory, and all necessary Helps and Means thereunto.

§. 20. The Penalty was, 1. The *Privation of Recovery*; 2. and a *far sorer punishment for Ingratitude and contempt of Christ and Mercy.*

John 3. 18, 19.

Matth. 28. 20.

Heb. 10. 29,

& 2. 3.

§. 21. This Law or Covenant in this *first Edition* was made with *Adam* as the Father of all Mankind, and so with *all Mankind in him*, as truly and as much as the Covenant of Innocency was: For, 1. God's Word maketh no difference. 2. *Adam* was as much after the Common Father of Mankind, and all we as much in him, as before the Fall. And he that will say that God arbitrarily Judgeth otherwise of us, must prove it if he can. 3. The express Word of God in many places proveth it, joyning *Children* with their Parents in such Blessings, and therefore including the *Children of Adam.*

§. 22. The same Covenant with some positive Additions, it pleased God to renew to and with *Noah*, because he was as a second Head and Father to the generality of all Mankind, all coming from his Loins as they did from *Adam's.*

§. 23. As all Mankind was made the Subjects of God under this Law of Grace, so by it they were all to be Governed and Judged, allowing a diversity of Degrees, in the Promulgation, Mercies and Penalties thereof.

S E C T. IV.

Of the same Law with Abraham's Covenant of Peculiarity, and the Mosaical Jewish Law of Works.

§. 1. **A** *Braham* being a subject to this same Law of Grace, did so faithfully Believe and Obey it, that it pleased God to reward him extraordinarily, by, 1. *Renewing the Covenant* by special Application to him, and by the promises of Peculiar Privileges to him and his seed.

§. 2. Not that his Infant seed was the first that was taken into Covenant. For the Covenant of Grace had from the beginning been made with the Faithful and their Seed, as well as the Covenant of Innocency was.

§. 3. The Peculiarities of this Covenant were Initially promulgate to *Abraham, Isaac and Jacob*; and more fully to the Jews as a Politick Body, by *Moses* in the Law; with some particular Sub-additions by *David* and the Prophets.

§. 4. 1st. The Promise to *Abraham* was, besides the Common Covenant of Grace, renewed. 1. A promise of peculiar Favour to his Seed increased to a political Society in *Canaan*, and differenced by special Mercies from all the People of the Earth. 2. A promise that the *Messiah* should be of his Seed.

§. 5. This Covenant did not Discovenant the rest that the World, nor put them into any worse Condition than they were before.

§. 6. The peculiar Precept of that Covenant was, That by Circumcision as a Seal and Symbol, and by peculiar Gratitude and Obedience, and relinquish-

linguishing the Sins of the Degenerate World about them, they should difference themselves from others, as God's *peculiar People*.

§. 7. As the Covenant of *Peculiarity* was not a *separated state*, but an additional Privilege and Reward to *Abraham* as faithful to the Common Covenant of Grace; so *Circumcision* was the Symbol neither of *Abraham* as under the Law of Grace alone, nor as under the Covenant of *Peculiarity* alone (for that was never alone) but as of *One* under both, even under the latter as a Reward for his special Fidelity in the former. And so it was a Seal of the Righteousness of the Faith in the Common Covenant of Grace, which he had being yet *Uncircumcised*, though a Symbol also of his after *Peculiarities*, Rom. 4. 1, 2, &c.

§. 8. Infants interest in the very Covenant of *Peculiarity*, and *Jewish Church-state*, was not inseparable from *Circumcision*. As Infants were ever Members in the Common Church and Covenant of Grace with their Parents before *Circumcision*, so they were also without it Members of the *Jewish Church*, when as all the *Females* were Members, and all the *Males* in the *Wilderness*, who for Forty Years were *Uncircumcised*: Yet is it called, *The Church in the Wilderness*, when except very few at last it was an *Uncircumcised Church*, Acts 7. 38.

§. 9. Much less did God lay such a necessity on the outward Sacramental Act, as to deny *Salvation* to the *Uncircumcised* aforesaid, as some would have us think that even under the Gospel he doth by Sacraments. The Covenant was still necessary as consented to by the Adult for themselves and their Infant

seed, but not alway the outward sacrament or symbol.

§. 10. The gathering of *Israel* into a Policy by *Moses*, as a Theocracy, and their receiving a Law from God himself as a Political Body, was but the full Establishment of the Covenant of *Peculiarity*, in performance of what God had promised to *Abraham*, and in Circumcision had begun.

§. 11. This Law of *Moses* therefore must be Considered as an Affix or Appendix to the Common Law of Grace, and so either as related to it, or as considered simply and distinctly in it self without that relation. And as it was a Divine Political Law, for the Government of a Republick as such.

§. 12. The Common Covenant of Grace was the Soul as it were of this Political Jewish Law; and therefore was really expressed in it, in the Decalogue and other parts: As it was the Soul of their state of *Peculiarity*, which was the Reward of *Abraham's* Faithfulness in the Common Covenant: And their peculiar Promise to *Abraham's* Seed as the Nations Blessing, with their Types and Prophecies all led them to Christ more plainly than he was revealed to others.

§. 13. The Law as such an Appendix, contained Preceptively the Decalogue as the Summary and *Stamina*, and the particular Determinations under it, as belonging to the First and Second Table; For all those (not accurately distinguished as *Moral*, *Political* and *Ceremonial*,) are but the particular Determinations of the things only Generally expressed in the Decalogue, according to which they are fitlier distributed.

§. 14. It pleased God to make the particular Precepts (about Worship and Political Converse)

so many, and the Sacrifices so Costly, and the Penalties so Severe, as that it became a very operous Employment to do the External Acts of it; which the People made a Snare of to themselves: For, 1. Thereby they were so taken up with the outward Work, that they neglected the inward spiritual exercises of the Soul, without which all the rest are dead and carnal things. 2. And they hereby grew into so high a conceit with the Letter of the *Law* it self, and these External Duties, as that they thought the very doing of them was enough to make them just and acceptable to God, and forgot the true Doctrine of the Promised Messiah, and Righteousness by him. 3. And hereby they grew Proud as if they had for these Externals, been so much better than all other People, that all the World was Abominable save they. 4. And they were so intent on the present Political Punishments to be escaped or suffered, and Rewards to be won or lost, that they much overlook'd the everlasting Punishments and Rewards: And this Corruption increased till Christ came to Cure it; who found the *Saducees* not believing a Life to come, and the *Pharisees* deceived by their External Legal Works and Righteousness, and most of the People too, ignorant of the true Spiritual Righteousness required by the Law it self.

§. 15. It may seem to some a difficult Question whether God by such a Law made them *Happier* or *Worse* than the rest of the World? And whether Christ's Abrogation of it was not a returning them to the *common, easier and better* Condition

Acts 15. 10. Gal.
5. 1. & Rom. 7.
& 8. 3, 4. Gal. 3.
& 4. & 5. Heb.
7. & 10. Rom. 3.
& 4. & 5. Mat.
5.

tion of Mankind ? *Ans.* 1. You must know, that though God made a *common Covenant of Grace* with *Mankind*, the rest of the Nations about them were *fall'n into Ignorance and Idolatry*; and the Jewish Law much tended to cure both, and to make them better know God and the meaning of the Covenant of Grace, and to return to him from Idols, and worship him aright. So that the Jews were happier than other Nations. 2. The abuse of their Law was through their fault and folly, and the Law by the faithful among them was better understood and used. 3. Christ, after setting up a *better Covenant* in its stead, did bring the Church into a better state than the Jews were: But the Unbelievers and idolatrous World, that had not Christ's better Covenant, were still left in a worse state than the Jews were before Christ's Incarnation.

§. 16. And God by this *operous Law* would humble the Jews, that by their peculiarity were apt to be puffed up with Pride: And as all his works grow to Perfection by degrees, even the Works of Grace in particular Souls, so did his Means of Grace, and the welfare of his Church; which was to begin at their Rudiments, and grow up to better means and knowledge: yet so that all were to be judged according to the Law that they were under.

§. 17. It is this *operous Law of Moses* which Paul meaneth usually by the [*Law of Works*, and the *old or former Covenant*] and neither the Law or Covenant of *Innocency* made to *Adam*, nor yet as if this Law of *Moses* were of the *same Tenor or Conditions*, and so called a Covenant of *Works*, as making *Innocency its Condition*: But this Law
which

which was an Appendix to the Law of Grace, and was a peculiar Law of Grace it self, is called, *The Law of Works*, because of the great and burdensome and costly Externals before mentioned, and because as a *political* Law it so much insisteth comparatively on those Externals, and the Doctrine of Grace is comparatively more obscure in it than in the Gospel; and because the Jews had by their abusive Interpretation overvalued the Externals and operous Ceremonies and Sacrifices of it.

§. 18. The mistake of *Paul's* meaning in this Phrase [*the Law of Works, or old Covenant*] hath led some men to a new frame of Theology in a great part, and engaged others in Errors, and fruitless Contentions.

§. 19. By the words [*He that doth these things shall live by them*] as distinguished from *believing*, *Paul* meant not that the Condition of the Jewish Covenant of Peculiarity or Law, was the same perfect Innocency as was required in the first Law of *Adam*; for when Man was actually guilty, it was impossible that he should ever become one that had not sinned: And we must not put such a scorn on the infinitely wise and righteous Governour of the World, as to suppose him to have such a Law or Covenant as this [*If you that are sinners are not sinners you shall be saved*], much less to make this a Covenant of peculiar favour.

§. 20. Nor doth *Paul* mean, That the Laws Condition was [*If you will never sin more, I will pardon all that's past*]. For God never made such a Law with man; *not to sin* being morally impossible to them, and Pardon never offered on such terms.

§. 21. To

§. 21. To put all out of doubt, 1. God before-hand proclaimed the Name of that God from whom they received their Law, *Exod. 34. 6, 7. The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long suffering and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping Mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity, transgression and sin, though he will by no means clear the guilty.* (That is, He will not judge a Sinner to be no Sinner, nor the Wicked to be Godly, nor pardon and save any contrary to the established terms of his Covenant.) 2. And the Law it self hath many express means of forgiveness of Sin appointed, as sacrificing, confessing, &c. which sheweth that it was a Law of Grace.

§. 22. By the Law, Paul usually meaneth the written Law of Moses, as contained in the very words now in our Bibles: As by the Word of God we usually mean the Scripture. Therefore though it contain much of the Law of Nature, yet as a written Law, and part of a Law of Peculiarity and Policy of that Nation, even the Decalogue may be said to be done away, though as the Law of Nature and of Christ it still remain.

§. 23. By the Works of the Law then, which Paul mostly disputeth of, and by [*He that doth these things shall live in them*] is meant, That this Law, besides the sweet and easie Precepts of Faith and Love, did as part of the Matter of the Jews Obedience, require abundance of burdensome Externals, and he that would not do all those must die (for Obedience even to those commanded Tasks was then made necessary by God): And as to temporal death, it was not by that Law to be escaped, but on the strict terms thereby required: So that doing these things, was necessary to life temporal,

ral, (and to *eternal* in sincerity): And the driving on the People by temporal punishments to these externals, was that Body of the Law which the mistaking Jews had separated from the Soul of it.

§. 24. And he saith, *None could be justified by the Works of the Law*, because this *written political Law* and its *externals*, were in this Dispute put in opposition to *Christ*, and the Law taken for the meer *Body of Moses's Law*, separated from the *Law of Grace*, which was its *Soul*; and no doubt, 1. It is *Faith in the Redeemer* and *Covenant of Grace*, which is the *Condition of constituting Men just*, (which they must have before any Obedience to their particular Laws could be sincere and acceptable :) and the faithful *keeping of the Law of Grace*, which is made the *Condition of salvation*.

2. And to dream that legal Strictness, Ceremonies, Sacrifices, or other legal Works, would justify them without *Christ* and *Faith in him*, or any otherwise than as Acts of Obedience to their Redeemer, by which their fidelity to the *Covenant of Grace* was to be expressed while that Law was in force, was contrary to the true meaning of their Law it self.

§. 25. The rest of the World were not in the *Covenant*, nor under the *Law of Peculiarity* or *Jewish Policy*. And as *such* (as is said) it is now all *abrogated*, even the *Decalogue* it self, though its Matter be still in force, as *aforsaid*.

S E C T. V.

Of the Law or Covenant of Grace in the last Edition, or the Gospel.

§. 1. **VV**Hether the Covenant of Grace in the first edition to *Adam*, and this of the second edition by *Christ*, shall be called One or Two, the same or divers, and the old Church and the Gospel-Church the same or not the same *in specie*, are but needless questions about the bare *Name* of *Oneness*, as long as we agree wherein they differ, and wherein they differ not. In some respects they may be called the same, and in some not the same.

§. 2. The Parties in the *first Covenant of Grace* were really but two: *GOD* and *Man* (unless you could prove that *Christ* had then such a *superangelical* Nature in which he mediated, as some before mentioned hold). But the Parties in the new *Covenant of Grace* are really *Three*, viz. *G O D* as the absolutely Supreme, who gave us a *Mediator*; and *Christ* the *Mediator*, as the supreme Subadministrator to whom all Power is given, and *Man* the Subject to both.

§. 3. The Benefits of the first Edition, respected a *future Saviour* and his *future Righteousness*, *Sacrifice*, and *Merits*: But the Benefits of the second Edition respect an *existent Mediator* and his *merits* and *sacrifice* already performed, and accepted of *God*.

§. 4. The revelation of *life eternal* and *Man's* spiritual felicity and duty, is far clearer in the second Edition than in the first.

§. 5. As

§. 5. As there is *more* done for us, so there are more full and excellent means provided for Man's information, conversion, sanctification and salvation, in Apostles, Scriptures, Miracles, spiritual Ordinances, than under the first.

§. 6. As the *means* excel, so the *Spirit* is given in a *greater measure*, answerable to the *greater Revelation* and *means*: And is specially *Christ's Witness* and *Agent* in the World, and the *mark* of his peculiar ones.

§. 7. And as more is done for us, so more is now *to be believed* by us: Many necessary Articles are added to our Faith: That *this Jesus* is the *Messiah*, that he was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin *Mary*, suffered under *P. Pilate*, was crucified, dead and buried, descended to *Hades*, rose again the third day, ascended to Heaven, is there glorified in our Nature, Head of all, &c. are all new Articles of our Faith, which before were not required, because not revealed, or the matter extant.

§. 8. This second Edition is both the *Covenant of Grace*, and a *Covenant of Peculiarity*, far excelling the *Jewish Covenant of Peculiarity*: Believers are a holy Nation, a royal Priesthood, a peculiar People, &c.

§. 9. This Covenant supposeth the *antecedent gifts* of a *Saviour* to be incarnate, and do his *meritorious* and *sacrificing part*, and all such Preparatories, and of Life, Gospel and Opportunities given to the Sinner.

§. 10. The parts of the Covenant are, 1. The *Conditional Gifts or Benefits*. 2. The *Condition or Terms of Right*. 3. The *Rule of Duty*. 4. The *Penalty*.

Penalty for violation or neglect of the Covenant.

§. 11. 1. The Gifts are, *God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost in their Covenant-Relation to us, and the love of the Father, the Grace of the Son, and the Communion of the Holy Spirit.* Or as it is briefly expressed in 1 Joh. 5. 10, 11. *Christ and life in him, that is, Pardon, Justification, the Spirit, Adoption and Glory, at first in right, and after in possession; and all means and mercies which God seeth meet to bring us to it.*

§. 12. 2. The Condition of our first Right is, 1. That of natural necessity, viz. *Repentance and Return to God*; 2. Of natural and instituted necessity, *Belief and Confidence in Christ, and Covenant-Consent.*

§. 13. The Condition of our continued and consummate Right and full Possession, is the former Faith and Consent continued, Repentance renewed when we knowingly sin, and sincere Obedience and Perseverance.

§. 14. 3. Seeing sincere Obedience supposeth a Law, we must know that more is in the Precept than in the Condition: Therefore we distinguish of *necessitas precepti & medii*. The Precept requireth perfect Obedience as due: But Sincerity is the Condition, and will save without Perfection.

§. 14. The Precepts or Law of Christ now contain, 1. *The Law of Nature* (for all Things and Judgment are given up to him.) 2. *The new peculiar Laws of Grace*, containing our special Faith in Christ, and his special Institutions of Church-Order, Ministry, Worship, &c.

§. 15. The

§. 15. The *Penalty* of the Law of Grace in this Edition, is as in the first. 1. A *Privation* of its Benefits to *Nonconsenters* or *Infidels*, with a greater degree of punishment for Ingratitude. 2. And withdrawals of the Spirits help for our quenching and relisting it, and abusing Mercy. 3. And temporal castigatory Punishments to Believers for their faults.

§. 16. The Sum of all essential to this Covenant, is in *Baptism*, and the *Lords Supper*, which are therefore Sacraments and Symbols of it; and *Baptism* was appointed by Christ himself to be the solemn Initiation, Badge, and Character of his Disciples and Church-Members.

§. 17. The History of Christ's Life and Sufferings, and of his Apostles Life and Preaching, and all the rest of *holy Scripture*, is God's Word, and his Doctrine belonging to the Gospel-Covenant. But it is the *Covenant it self*, or *Law of Grace*, which all that are under it, must be ruled and judged by, and constituteth the Essentials of Christianity.

§. 18. This Covenant did constitute Christianity many years (supposed eight) before any part of the New Testament was written, as now extant, and near seventy years before it was all written.

§. 19. As Man hath an *Intellect*, a *Will*, and an *Executive power*, and the Gospel is to work on all, so the Creed is the Summary of our *Belief*, the *Lords Prayer*, of our *Desire*; and the *Christian Decalogue* and *Institutions*, of our *practice*, as expounding what Baptism generally expresth.

§. 20. Though to the *Jews* that were bred up under the use of the Old Testament, and that expected

pected the Messiah, the Apostles staid not long instructing them, before they baptized them, when they professed Repentance and Faith in Christ; yet it cannot be conceived, but that with the ignorant Gentile Christians, all Teachers took pains to make them understand, first what they were to profess and promise; for ignorant doing they know not what, pleaseth not God. And therefore that the Faith contained in the *three Baptismal Articles*, was certainly *explained in more words*, and accordingly *professed*; which must be in substance that called the Apostles Creed, which the Churches preservation and use, with the Custom of long instructing Catecumens, giveth us notice of, as well as the reason of the thing.

§. 21. When we find Christ commanding his Apostles to *disciple the Nations*, and *baptize them in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, and *teach them all his Commandments*; and when we daily see, after people have learned to say, *They believe in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, how long it is ere they understand the *meaning* of those three Articles; and when we know that it is not *bare words*, without the *sence*, that constituteth the Christian Faith; no sober Man will doubt, whether the persons to be baptized were taught the *sence* as well as the words; which must be done by *more words*. And it is certain that those Words were not to *alter* Christ's Baptismal Covenant, nor the Nature and Terms of Christianity, but to *expound* them. And it is certain, that multitudes were so weak, that had those Words been very long and many, they would rather have burdened them, than become their own profession, as understood and remembered. And it is certain, that the changing of words doth easily

easily turn to a change of the sense ; and that even then Heresies quickly multiplied ; which made it necessary to the Church to be careful to preserve sound Doctrine. From all which it clearly followeth, that a *Creed* (that is, a Summary Profession of Belief explaining the *Baptismal Articles*) was in common use in all the Churches many years before the writing of the New Testament. And it is not likely that in the Apostles days the Churches did receive it from any but themselves.

§. 22. Yet it is not probable that they composed exactly such a Form of Words as might not at all be altered, and used still the very same terms ; for the *Creeds* recited by *Irenaeus*, *Tertullian*, *Marcellus* in *Epiphanius*, and others, do all differ in some words from one another, and some *Articles* have been added since the rest (of which see *Usher* and *Vossius de Symbolis.*) But (except those few Additions) they all agree in Sense ; which may persuade us that the ancient Churches kept still to Words which signified the same matter of the Articles of our common Creed, and admitted no variation of the Words, but such as was small, and endangered not the Doctrine.

§. 23. Though *Baptism* explained by the *Symbol of Faith*, *Lords Prayer*, and *Decalogue*, contain at least the Constitutive *Essentials* of Christianity, yet the *Integrals* are much larger, and all that Christ commanded was to be taught the Church. And though this was done by *Voice* many years by the Apostles before they wrote any part of the New Testament, yet the Memory of men from Generation to Generation, would have been a very unsafe and treacherous Preserver of so many things, had they been committed to Memory alone :

Therefore it pleased the Wisdom and Love of God, to inspire the Apostles prophetically and infallibly to commit the Sum of the History of Christ's Life, Sufferings, and Death, &c. with all the Integrals of his Word, to those durable and sacred Records which we call the Holy Scriptures, for the easier and fuller Propagation and Preservation of the Christian Faith, and all its Integrals, especially his Example and sacred Precepts; yea, and the necessary Accidentals, or Appurtenances.

§. 24. Because the Scriptures contain both in Words and Sense, much more than the Essentials of Christianity, and so more than is of absolute necessity to Salvation; many a million may be saved, that understand not all that is in the Scriptures; nay, no man on Earth understandeth it perfectly: And he that understandeth and receiveth the Essentials, shall be saved, though he were ignorant of a thousand particular Texts.

§. 25. Therefore it is that the Church hath ever selected the great and most necessary Truths, and taught Children and Catechised Persons these before the rest, by way of Catechism; of which the foresaid Creed, Lords Prayer, and Decalogue are the Sum, and the Sacramental Covenant is that Sum yet more contracted. And it hath not been the Churches way to teach Children or Converts the Bible over in order indifferently, without selecting first the Marrow out of the whole, which the Ignorant cannot do for themselves.

§. 26. Besides the Method or Order of the Scripture books, there is specially to be studied by those that will be more perfect than the ruder sort, the true Method of the Body of Doctrine, contained in all the Scriptures: For all the parts
of

of that Doctrine have that Place, Order, and Respect each to other, as maketh up the Beauty and Harmony which is in the whole. And even in the *Covenants*, the *Creed*, *Lords Prayer*, and *Decalogue*, there is a most excellent Order and Method, above all that is found in *Aristotle*, or any humane Writers, though, alas ! too few perceive it.

§. 27. Therefore they that gather true *Systems* of *Theology*, do not add to the Scripture, nor feign it to have a Method which it hath not (no more than Catechisms do) but only gather out that Doctrine which is there, and deliver it in the true Scripture-method ; not as it lieth in the order of Words, but in the order of Relation that one Truth hath to another. And to despise this real Method, because every dull and slothful Wit doth not see it in the Scriptures, is indeed to despise the Matter and Design of the Scripture, and to despise all true and clear Knowledge of things Divine : For to see Truths placed in their proper Order, doth differ from a knowing of some confused parcels, as knowing the parts of a Man, a Picture, a Clock, a House, a Ship, &c. duly compaginated, and seeing all the parts cast confusedly on a heap. But to draw up a *true Method* is the Work of a skilful hand ; and mistaken ones so seduce, that one Error in the Order leads to many.

§. 28. Yet even Catechumens and young Christians should learn what they learn in *method*: And that is first the said *Baptismal Covenant*, and our Relation to the Trinity thereby ; and all that is added to their Knowledge daily (be it never so little) should be methodically added : For a weak head may perceive the true method of the

few Essentials (being great and plain), though the strongest cannot follow the due Distribution of innumerable Integrals and Consequent Truths: As the first partitions of the Tree into its greater Boughs, are easily perceived, though not the innumerable sprigs thence arising.

§. 29. Accordingly a wise Teacher will proceed with *Infidels in proving the Christian Religion*, (yea, and with himself); and will first prove the *Truth of the Essentials* (which are delivered us both in Scripture, and other infallible Tradition) before he undertake to prove *all the Scriptures* to be the Word of God: For he that will begin here, 1. Must shew the Book which he will so prove; and when he cannot vindicate it from *variety of Lessons*, and the Errors of *Scribes and Printers* (to say nothing of the greater of *Translators*) it will stop him in his Designs. 2. And when he hath so many thousand Words to prove to be Divine, and so many Integrals and Accidentals to make good, he maketh his Work difficult, by allowing his Scholar to doubt as much of the Essentials of Religion, as he shall doubt of the Truth of any particular Book or Text, History, Genealogy, &c. in the whole Scripture. A blind Zeal for Scripture hath led some to this dangerous way; but the ancient Churches did otherwise, and so will all that well understand what they do. And really on supposition it could be proved (as it cannot) that any Penman of the Scripture erred in a Citation, a Genealogy, the Circumstance of a bye-History, &c. it would not follow, that we must be therefore uncertain of all our Religion, even the Essentials; and they ignorantly betray their Faith, that say, *It would so follow.*

§. 30. So far is it from being true, that the Scripture is *too narrow*, as to the matter of Divine Faith and Duty, without the additional matter of *Tradition*, that indeed, as the compleat Body of a Man hath more than his *Essentials*, yea, or *Integrals*, even Hair and Nails, as Accidents, so hath the Holy Scripture, as to the *matter of Divine Faith and Duty*. There is *more* than is absolutely necessary to Salvation, but not *less*.

§. 31. They that in peevish opposition to others, tell us, That Christ made *no Law*, and that the Gospel is *not a Law*, if they strive not about *equivocal Words*, but mean that Christ is not a *Legislator*, nor hath a *Law and Covenant* by which he will govern and judge the World, do deny all our *Christianity* at once: For Christ is *not Christ*, if he be not the *King of the Church*; nor is he *King*, if he be not a *Lawgiver*; nor doth he *Rule and Judge*, if he have *no Law*; which is so far from Truth, that there is now *no Law of God* that we are under, but what is truly the *Law of Christ*: For he is *Lord of all*, and *Head over all things to his Church*; and *all power in Heaven and Earth is given to him*; and the *Father* (alone, or meerly as *Creator*, by the *Law of Innocency*) *judgeth no man, but hath committed all Judgment to the Son*, as Redeemer and Universal Administrator. The lapsed World, and the Law which they are under, as rational Creatures, are now delivered up to the Redeemer, whose Law (as is aforesaid) hath two parts; 1. The Law of lapsed Nature, (commonly called the Moral Law.) 2. The Remediying Law of Faith; of which before.

John. 17.2. & 13.
3. Matt. 28. 19.
Rom. 14.9. John
5. 22. Eph. 1.
23.

§. 32. But it is not to be supposed, that the *very preceptive part of the Law of Innocency* is now in force to us, as it was to *Adam*: For it bound him to be perfectly innocent in *Act* and *Dispositions*. But to a Man that hath *lost his Innocency*, and is already in *Act* and *Habit* sinful, it is not to be supposed, that the Law saith, *Thou shalt be innocent*: For that were to command not only a *Moral*, but a *Physical absolute impossibility*, as saying, *Thou shalt not have sinned*.

§. 33. Obj. God changeth not his Law when man changeth his capacity: Therefore the Law may be the same as in Innocency, both as to the Precept, Threatning, and Promise: God may still say, 1. Sin not, or be innocent: 2. And if thou be perfect, thou shalt live: 3. Else thou shalt die. And if man will make himself incapable, it's his own change.

§. 34. Answ. I spake to this before, and now further add; God's Law is not to be taken for a meer script of Words considered as standing in a Book not obliterated, or as written on stone, and not broken, or cast away: The signum materially may stand, and the Law be changed, and the signification cease: As a repealed Statute may be still in the Books and Records: God's Law is *signum voluntatis divinae, debitum constituentis*: Therefore if it signifie not God's Will as constituting what shall be due from us, and to us, it is no Law. And that it may so signifie his Will, and constitute *Dueneſs* (*Debitum* or *Jus*) (or as they use to say, oblige and give) the Subject must be in a natural capacity: For where there is no Subject to be obliged, there is no Law. And where natural capacity ceaseth (as in a dead corps) there is no Subject to be governed: And the Law is *Instrumentum regiminis*. So that

that if you do not only say, *This was God's Law*, but *This is God's Law*, you must mean, *Thus he now obligeth man*, and *This he threatneth now*, and *This he conditionally giveth him*. So that if it be an unchanged Law to us, just as it was in Innocency, you must make this the sence of precept, threat, and promise. 1. [*Preserve thine Innocency, and sin not in act or habit, but be thou a perfect Obeier of my Laws;*] and this to one that hath sinned already, and is habitually inclined to more: q. d. [*Let not that be which is, or quod factum est infectum fiat.* 2. *If thou sin, thou shalt be an Heir of Death.*] When we are Sinners, and Heirs of Death already: 3. [*If thou be, and continue sinless and perfect, thou shalt not die but live.*] When we are Sinners and dead before. In which Case, all Law and Reason saith, That the Law doth *transire in sententiam, vel rem judicatam*.

§. 35. So that, as was before-said, the Covenant of Works is ceased; yea, the Law or Precept bindeth not now, as it is a Law of Innocency made to innocent Nature for its preservation, for Nature is not innocent: But the Law of Nature is now the Law of lapsed redeemed Nature, and not of innocent Nature. And it obligeth us for the future to as much perfection of Duty, as we are naturally capable of performing at that time, though viciously indisposed, it being only natural disability, and not moral vicious unwillingness that hindereth Obligation: But though (*not to do all that we can*) be peccare, yet it is not to sin unto Death or Damnation, if he perform so much as is made by Christ the Condition of life. In short; 1. Before mans sin, he was under the proper Law and Covenant of Innocency, which made perfect personal Innocency

cy the Condition of life. 2. Immediately after sinning, before the Promise, man was not under any Promise of life on condition of Innocency, nor yet under the Command of being innocent, nor of seeking and hoping for life on that Condition: For upon the Impossibility these ceased, without a Repeal, *cessante capacitate subditi*: But man was then under no Covenant or premiant Law: But under, 1. The Command of perfect Obedience for the future. 2. The Obligation to Punishment, not pcremptory, but due for every sin, unless it should be pardoned on due satisfaction: These two Obligations man was under between the Fall and the Promise.

3. But next, *sinful condemned man*, with his said Obligation, was delivered into the hands of the Redeemer, who now continueth the said Law of lapsed Nature (making perfect Obedience *de futuro* due, or Death for sin in *primo instanti*;) but adding the Remedying Law of Grace, giving Christ, Pardon and Life to penitent Believers.

§. 36. The Question, What Punishment is due to *Venial sin*, must be resolved from the sence of the Law that obligeth us: And the Question is not what Punishment *would have been due* to the smallest sin, if the Covenant of *Innocency* had continued; but what *is due* to it by the Law of *Redeemed Nature* and of *Grace*, which is in force.

§. 37. There is a *three-fold Dueness* (or *Desert*) here considerable (without distinguishing of which, many such Questions cannot be answered.) 1. A *Dueness* of *natural Congruity*, without any Remedy which the Law gave, or took notice of: So *Death* was due for every sin by the Law of Innocency (as I think).

2. A *Dueness* of natural Congruity with an *affixed Remedy*, which hindereth the guilt from being compleat and fixed. And such is the *Dueness* of punishment to the least real sin, by the Law of Redeemed Nature, to which the Law of Grace is annexed, giving a *Conditional Pardon* to all the World for the Merits of the Redeemer. As if God said, [*Thy sin in strict Justice is worthy of death, but I will forgive thee, if thou repent and believe in Christ.*] Here is so much *Dueness* as needeth pardon; but it is *virtually, conditionally pardoned* as soon as committed; and so it is not a plenary Obligation to punishment.

3. A *Remediless Dueness* (or *Guilt*) by natural Congruity and *peremptory determination* of the Law-giver: And such was the *Guilt* of temporal death for sin against the Law of Innocency, (at least the eating of the forbidden Fruit) (for so far it is not forgiven); and the *Guilt* of perpetual misery to impenitent Unbelievers and ungodly Ones, that so die.

§. 38. By this it appeareth, that sins of meer *Infirmity*, consistent with *sincere Faith, Repentance, and Holiness*, in the *second sence* deserve punishment (not all alike, but) according to the degree of the Offence: But not in the *first sence*, or the *last*.

§. 39. Accordingly a great Question must be determined, Whether the sins of the *Faithful* deserve any more than a *temporal Chastisement*? And whether they may *pray* for pardon of *perpetual punishment*, or *need any such pardon*? *Ans.* The sins of the Godly deserve *everlasting punishment* in the *second Sence*, or *Degree* of Desert or *Dueness*; which is so far as to need a *Saviour and Pardon*, and so as they must *pray* for, and *receive* that *pardon*:

don: But not in the *first* or *third* Sence.

§. 40. It is the *Law of Christ*, or of *Grace*, which is *norma officii & judicii*, and by which we must be judged at the last day.

§. 41. It is of great importance in the Controversies of Justification, to know whether, or how far we shall be judged by the *Law of Innocency*, or whether only by the *Law of Grace*.

He that is judged by the *Law of Innocency*, must be justified by *personal, perfect, perpetual Obedience* (not by *another's*) or be condemned: But he that is judged by the *Law of Grace*, must be justified by *Christ's Merits and Sacrifice* (or *Righteousness*) as purchasing his Grant of a Pardon and life, or Right to Impunity and Glory, given by the *Covenant of Grace* conditionally, with his own performance of that Condition.

C H A P. XIII.

Of the Universality and Sufficiency of Grace.

§. 1. **I**T was not only the *Nature* of the *Elect*, but of all *Mankind*, that *Christ* assumed in his Incarnation.

§. 2. It was not to *Adam* only, as the *Father of the Elect*, but as the *common Father of Mankind* (lapsed) that God made the Promise, or conditional Law, or Covenant of Grace, *Gen. 3. 15*. And so renewed it with *Noah*.

§. 3. It was not the *sin* of the *Elect* only, but of all *Mankind* that were the occasion of *Christ's* suffer-

sufferings, (called by some, *An assumed meritorious Cause*, because by his consent they were *loco Cause meritorie.*)

§. 4. It is not to the *Elect only*, but for *all the World* (as to the *Tenor* of it) that Christ hath purchased, and given a *conditional Pardon* of sin, and a *conditional Donation* of *Life eternal* in the *Covenant of Grace*, both of the first and second Edition: That is, the *conditional Grant* is *Universal*; *Whoever believeth shall be saved*: Though the *Promulgation* of it may have many stops.

§. 5. It is not to the *Elect only*, but to *All*, that Christ hath commanded his Ministers to proclaim this *Law or Covenant*, and offer the *Benefits*, and require their *Consent*, as far as the said Ministers are able.

§. 6. It is not only to the *Elect*, but to *all Mankind*, that many *Mercies* procured by pardoning and reconciling *Grace* are actually given, which were forfeited (or not due) by reason of sin against the *Law of Innocency*.

§. 7. These *Mercies* given to all Mankind after sin, and contrary to desert, are not given by *Gods Mercy alone*, without respect to the *Blood and Merits of Christ*: But his *Blood and Merits* are the Cause of them, as truly as of the greater *Mercies* of the *Elect*. And they that say, That God doth give all these *Mercies* without a *Saviour's Merits*, as the Cause, prepare the way for *Infidels* to infer, That then he might have done so by the *Mercies* of the *Elect*.

§. 8. All these *actual Mercies* given to mankind, contrary to Merit, are a degree of *Promulgation of the Law of Grace*, telling all the World, That God doth not now rule and judge them meerly by the
Law

Law of Innocency, but upon Terms of Mercy (as is aforesaid.)

§. 9. Hereby it is signified to all the World, that God is as he proclaimed his Name to *Moses*, *Exod. 34. 5, 6, 7. The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity, and transgression, and sin, and that will by no means clear the guilty* (by false judging:) and that the World have no cause to despair of

** Though this be said before, a new Case here causeth me to repeat it.*

forgiveness, as if they were * under the remediless (or unremedied) Sentence of Damnation.

§. 10. There are no People on Earth that are not obliged to the use of *some means* appointed them to be used for their full Pardon and Salvation, else *Despair* would be their *Duty*, and they should not be judged *Sinners* for neglecting any such means. And were they not bound to do any thing for their own Salvation, their Sin and Misery that neglect so to do, would be far less than it is.

§. 11. Therefore all People have some such *Means*, that have a tendency to Recovery and Salvation afforded them by God.

§. 12. They that say, That all the Mercies of the *Non-elect*, are *no Mercies*, because through mens Sin, they end in their Misery, do perversely extenuate Gods Mercies and Man's Sin, and teach Sinners falsely to plead in Judgment, That they never abused, or sinned against Mercy, which God and their own Consciences will easily confute.

§. 13. In the Controverſie, *Whether Chriſt died for the Elect only, or for all Mankind*, it ſeemeth to me, that we little differ about the matter, but only ſtrive about ambiguous Words; even about one Syllable [*for*.] If to die [*for*] ſignifie [*for their ſins*,] under the reaſon of a Cauſe of Chriſt's Death, ſo (as *Parauſ* doth) we muſt all grant, that Chriſt died [*for*] all.

2. If (*for*) ſignifie [*eorum loco*] *in their ſtead*, ſo the Phraſe hath yet great Ambiguity, and will require a great deal of diſtinguiſhing for its due Explication: The various kinds and degrees of Benefits to which the Intention is limited, do leave the word liable to various Sences. Chriſt died ſo far in the ſtead of all *Mankind*, as to ſuffer Death (by his voluntary ſponſion) as a puniſhment deſerved to themſelves by ſin, to free them all from it, on condition of their ſuitable acceptance of his Grace. But if by [*for*] be meant (*in the civil perſon of all men, as representing them*) the Word is ſtill among *Lawyers* and all Writers, ambiguous. In a large ſence he may be ſaid to (*perſonate or represent*) another who doth it but *ſecundum quid*, and not *ſimpliciter*, *in parte aliqua*, vel *in tantum & ad hoc*, and not *in omni*, vel *ad omne*. And if any will ſo far ſtretch the Phraſe, and becauſe Chriſt ſuffered in the common *Nature* of man, will ſay that he ſuffered in *every man's Perſon*; or becauſe he had a ſpecial purpoſe of ſaving his Elect, will thence ſay, He died in *the perſon* of *Peter, John, and every elect Sinner*; I will not ſtrive againſt mens Phraſes, if they will explain them ſoundly: But in ſtrict Sence, as *Representing* a man, or doing it in his *Perſon*, ſignifieth, that Chriſt ſo died (and merited) in ſeveral
mens

mens Persons, as that the Law or Lawgiver doth take it to have been *in sensu civili*, their own suffering, and doing, and meriting, or to all *intents, purposes, and uses*, all one to them, as if they had so died and merited themselves :] thus Christ neither *died*, nor *obeyed* for any man (as shall be hereafter proved.)

But if by [*for*] is meant [*for mens benefit or good*] so it is yet ambiguous, and liable to a threefold sence, *viz.* 1. *Intentionally*, 2. *Aptitudinally*, 3. *Eventually*, for their good. And, 1. *Intentionally*, the Controversie either speaketh of Christ's *Divine Nature and Will*, or of the *Humane* : Concerning the former, the Question is the same with that about Election, or Gods Decrees, which is before spoken to, *viz.* How far God decreed good to all men by Christ's Death. As to Christ's *Humane Nature and Will*, it will prove but an arrogant unprofitable Question, Whether Christ as Man, knew the Names of every individual person in the World, or of every one of the Elect, and had a distinct Intent to save every one of those by Name that are saved : It's better let such Questions alone. 2. And [*Aptitudinally*,] there is no question but there is that in Christ's *Sufferings and Obedience, Sacrifice and Merit*, which is in its moral Nature adapted to the *Good and Salvation* of all, and hath that sufficiency thereto, which would accomplish it, if it were duly accepted and improved.

3. And as to the *Event*, we are agreed, *viz.* That *some*, and *not all* are saved by Christ's Death and Merits; but that *all* have great Mercies, which are the *fruits* of these, though many wilfully turn them to their Sin and Misery.

§. 14. By all this it appeareth, that it is a most unfavoury thing for men called *Divines* to dispute hotly, That *Christ* did or did not die and merit for all, and bitterly revile their Adversaries in the Controversie, without ever explaining that one ambiguous syllable [*FOR*], or telling men what they mean. And when it is well explained, we scarce know how to differ.

§. 15. For few will deny but that *Christ* suffered, not immediately *b. cause* Man sinned (as if Suffering were due to him meerly because we sinned) but because he undertook so to do, and was obliged so to do by the Law of Mediation: But remotely he suffered, not only because the *Elect* had sinned, but because all *Mankind* had sinned. That is, The *Conditional Pardon* and *Mercies* given to all Mankind, are such as *Christ's* Sacrifice and Merits must be congruously the Causes of, as well as the actual Pardon of Believers.

§. 16. But if the stress of the Controversie be laid on *Christ's* personating or representing *this man* or *that*, by that time this (humane, invented, ambiguous, unscriptural) Phrase is explained, either we shall be found to be all of a mind, or else some will run into an intolerable error about [*Christ's* dying and meriting in our civil person, and our dying and meriting by his natural person]; or else they will dispute themselves into a Wood of Uncertainties, and be lost about the sence of a word that cannot be sufficiently explained.

§. 17. And they that will lay the stress of the Controversie on the *Aptitude* or the *Event*, must be men of some singular Conceits, and not of the common judgment of the *Reformed Churches*, the *Lutherans*, the *Jesuites*, or the *Dominicans*, if they will

will disagree ; for here we are commonly agreed.

§. 18. But as far as I can discern, most Contenders lay the Controversie upon the point of *Divine Intention, Purpose or Decree* : viz. *Whether Christ as God did purpose to justify and save all men by his death ? or else, Whether he purposed to do good to all men by his death ?* Which Purpose is nothing but God's eternal Will or Decree. And why then do they make two Controversies of Election and Redemption, when they mean the same in both ? And here methinks there cannot easily be a difference. For (in a few plain words) *whatever good Christ giveth to any, that he from Eternity decreed to give them* : But we are agreed that he giveth not Salvation to all men, and yet that he doth give many and great Mercies to all men, and especially, that he hath given to the World (and not only to the Elect) an *express conditional Pardon of Sin, and conditional Justification, Reconciliation, Adoption and Right to Glory* : And sober Divines had rather say that this universal conditional Deed of Gift, is the effect of Christ's Sacrifice and Sufferings, than that God giveth it to one part of Men for Christ's death, and to the other part *not for his death, but as without it*. And we are agreed, that Christ doth give to some such *special Grace*, as shall and doth infallibly prevail with them to repent and believe, and also actual Pardon, Justification, Adoption and Salvation.

§. 19. Therefore in this sence Christ died for all, but not for all alike or equally ; that is, *He intended good to all, but not an equal good with an equal intention*. Whatever Christ giveth men in time as the fruit of his death, that he decreed from Eternity to give them. And whatever he never giveth them,

them, he never decreed to give them. What he giveth them absolutely, he decreed to give them absolutely. And what he giveth them but conditionally, he decreed to give them but conditionally. Therefore being agreed of the *fact* and *event*, we must be agreed of the *Intention* or *Decree*, and what needs there more?

And by this time you may answer their Objection that say, Why not a *common* and *conditional Election*, as well as a *common* and *conditional Redemption*? *Ans.* Neither of them are *conditional* as to the Act of God and Christ: There is no act of ours the Condition of God's *decreeing ex parte Dei*, but only of the thing decreed; nor of Christ's *Death* or *Intent*, but only of the benefit: That a *conditional* Act of Grace, or Deed of Gift of Christ and Life to all Mankind in common (in the tenor of it) should be made, was both decreed by God and purchased by Christ. But, 1. This is not the whole of God's Decree or Christ's Purchase and Intent. 2. And this is not to be called *Election*, as it signifieth a choosing of some from among the rest: Common Redemption and the Decree of Common Grace, both antecede that which is properly called Election, in order of Nature *in esse obiectivo*; that is, God decreeth to give Faith and Salvation effectually to some of them that had common Grace.

§. 20. The old Solution which Schoolmen and Protestants have acquiesced in, is, That *Christ died for All, as to the sufficiency of his death*, but not as to the *efficiency of their salvation*: Which is true, but must be thus explained: Christ's Death and Obedience were not only *sufficient* but *effectual* as to their *first effects*; that is, They effected that which is

commonly called, *Satisfaction* and *Merit*; and hence and from the Covenant of God they were also effectual to procure the *Covenant of Grace* as of *universal tenor*, and therein a free pardon of Sin and gift of Right to life-eternal to all, on condition of due acceptance: This conditional Gift of Christ and Life is effected: And this efficacy of the antecedent Mercies, must either be called part of the sufficiency of Redemption, as to the consequent Mercies (*viz.* Actual Pardon and Salvation) or else an efficiency beyond the sufficiency, antecedent to the said special efficiency. That Christ's Death hath effectually procured the Act of Oblivion or conditional Gift of Life to all Mankind; but it doth not effect the actual salvation of all: To the *universal Grace* it is both *sufficient* and *efficient*; but to the *special Grace* and *actual Salvation* it is sufficient to All (as after shall be opened) but not efficient, (which is by the Refuser's fault and forfeiture.)

§. 21. When we say, that either Christ's Death or Grace is sufficient to more than it effecteth, the meaning is, that it hath all things on its part which is *absolutely necessary* to the effect, but that somewhat else is supposed necessary to it, which is wanting.

§. 22. As there is a common Grace actually extended to Mankind, (that is, *common* of *Sufficient Mercies* contrary to their merit) so there is such a thing as *sufficient Grace* in *suo genere*, which is *not effectual*. So that though it be disputable in what cases this is found, and what not, yet that there is *such a thing* is past dispute.

§. 23. By sufficient Grace here I mean such without which *Man's Will* cannot, and with which it

it can perform the commanded Act toward which it is moved, when yet it doth not perform it; and this without any other degree of help than that which procureth not the act. So that it is not all that is useful to the effect, nor all that is necessary to ease or prompt performance, or to the infallible ascertaining of the act, nor to the *melius esse* only that we speak of; but so much as is necessary *ad esse*, and efficient of the true *posse*: When you can properly say that a Man can do this, you say that he hath all that is of necessity to the doing of it.

§. 24. *Jansenius* himself is so far from denying this Grace called *Sufficient*, that he asserteth that by this, improved by free-will, (without such special Grace, as of it self, giveth the Act as well as the Power) the good Angels stood when the bad ones fell, and Adam stood till the time of his Fall: And so that such a thing there hath been.

§. 25. And seeing God is still the same, and man's will the same in its natural faculties, and God seemeth to us to delight in Constancy, it is very improbably imagined, that God did for so short a time Rule Angels and Men by such a Grace, as he would never after make use of in the World; and that Man's free-will did for so short a time do its Duty by that *Sufficient Grace*, and never after do any one act by the like Grace, in any one to the World's end.

§. 26. It's true, that such Grace will not serve our turn to do that now in our lapsed state, which Adam could have done in Innocency (no, nor will all our effectual Grace yet reach it) that is, to have continued sinless: But it is incredible, that no common Grace of God now is as sufficient to the performance of the least good act (which is good but

secundum quid) as *Adam's* was to the fulfilling of all *God's Law*; and that the best unregenerate man is not able to do *any better than he doth*, or *forbear some Evil that he doth*, as well as *Adam* to have forborn all.

§. 27. At least, to the *Regenerate* such a Grace must be acknowledged: For though of the rest *Jansenius* will say, *They do no good*, because they *love not God and goodness* (and on the like reasons others will say, That the *Regenerate do no good*, because all hath sinful mixture or imperfection); yet he will not say so of the *godly*: And must we believe that no *godly* man can do any more good than he doth? and so, That he hath no meerly-sufficient Grace to any one act in all his life?

§. 28. The Controversie about *sufficient Grace* is the same in the true meaning of it with that of the *Power of Man's Free-will*: For when by *sufficient Grace* we mean nothing but the *enabling* a Man to the act, or giving him *Power* to do it, the stress of the Question is, Whether Man hath *truly any Power* to do more than he doth? For if he *have such a Power*, *Grace* hath given it him, if it be for a Work that *Grace* is needful to. So that indeed were it not for Custom and Expectation, this Question should be handled under that of the *Power and Liberty of Man's Will*.

§. 29. No man hath at the present *Grace* sufficient for his *Salvation*, if he have longer time to live: Because the *Grace* or help of the present hour is not sufficient for the next, but there must be continual Supplies from God; supposing that we distinguish of *Grace* by the distinct *numerical acts* and *hours* for and in which we need it: But if you distinguish of *Grace* by the *species of Acts* for which

which it is needful, and not by the numerical acts; then it may be truly said, that the same Grace (*in specie*) which a Believer hath to day, may be sufficient to his Salvation, or to his life's end.

§. 30. But if you speak *de gradu*, that Grace may be sufficient to *one thing*, which is not sufficient to another: And so, 1. An Infidel may have Grace sufficient to forbear some Sin, or avoid some *Temptation*, or use *some means* that tendeth to Faith and Repentance, who hath not Grace sufficient to *believe* and *repent* unto Salvation. 2. A man may have Grace sufficient to enable him to *believe* and *repent* unto Justification, and yet not have at that instant Grace sufficient to enable him to *love God above all as God, with a fixed habitual Love*, and to *live an holy life* (for the Spirit and Sanctification are promised on condition of *Faith* and *Repentance*). 3. A *sanctified* man that is yet but *weak*, may have Grace sufficient to live to God a holy life at present, and yet not have Grace sufficient for *greater trials* of Duty and Temptation: And therefore *Augustine* and all his Followers still say, That the Grace of *Perseverance* is a Gift over and above the Grace of meer Sanctification in the weakest degree.

§. 31. By all this it is evident, that he that disputeth of the *sufficiency* of Grace, must first distinctly tell us,

1. Whether he mean *extrinseck* Grace, or *intrinsic*.

2. If *extrinseck*, Whether he mean it comprehensively of *all extrinseck* Grace together, or only of some particular part or sort.

3. If the *latter*, Whether he speak of the sufficiency of *Christ's Death* and *Righteousness*, *Sacrifice*, *Mortification*, *Intercession*, &c. or of the sufficiency of the Gospel.

Covenant or Promise; or of the sufficiency of Preaching, Praying, and other means; or of the Scripture-Records, &c.

4. If he speak of *intrinsic* Grace, Whether the Question be of *Sufficiency ex parte Dei agentis*, (which none must question); or *ex parte effecti*.

5. If the latter, *What is the effect* whose sufficiency he questioneth? 1. Is it a Grace or Power to do some *more common good*, use *some means*, forbear some evil, as the Unregenerate may do? 2. Or is it a Power truly to *repent and believe*? 3. Or to *love God habitually*, and *live holily*? 4. Or to *overcome greater Temptations*, and *persevere*?

6. And he must tell you whether he speak, 1. *De specie*, whether the Grace or Power sufficient to *this sort of Acts or Duty* be sufficient to *another*, or *to all*. 2. Or *de gradu*, Whether this degree be sufficient against a greater degree or sort of *Temptation*. 3. Or as men use to distinguish Grace and Help by numerical Acts and Hours, Whether the Grace of this Hour and Act be sufficient for the *next*, or for *all*? The sence of all these Questions is distinct.

7. But his last and greatest difficulty will be, to tell you truly and plainly *what is that Grace* which is the subject of his Question, of its *sufficiency* in the *general nature* of it, and as related to the thing which it is called *sufficient* to.

§. 32. For, by Grace he meaneth, 1. Either somewhat *ex parte Dei agentis*, 2. Or *ex parte effecti*, or, 3. *Quid medium*; 1. Grace, as it is in God the Agent; 2. Or as it is in Man the Recipient; 3. Or as it is somewhat *between* both.

§. 33. I. *Grace*, as it is in God, is nothing but his *Essence*, not as *Essence*, but as an *essential Power*, *Intellect* and *Will* denominated by *Connotation* from the effect: This is commonly agreed on: God doth operate *per essentiam*, and not by *Accidents*.

§. 34. II. If they mean any *mediate thing* between God and the Effect, either they speak of the *first effect* or a *second*, and so on: If they speak but of secondary effects, and the meaning be only whether one effect be a *sufficient Cause* for another, they mean either an *outward* or an *inward* Grace or Effect. If an outward, then the sense of the Question is, Whether some other Work of God be sufficient to move the Will of Man? And then it must be told what other Work you mean: Whether an Angel, or the Planets, or the Word or Preacher, or an outward Mercy or Affliction, or what it is? But if you speak of the very first effect, then the fancy is almost proper to *Aureolus* among the Schoolmen, to think that there is something from God antecedent to the *Creature* and *Motion*, which may be called *Action* or *Energy*, or *Efflux*, which is neither the *Creator* nor a *Creature*, neither *Cause* substantial nor *Effect*, but *Causation*: As if some Beam of *Virtue* or *Force* went from God to produce every *Creature* and *Motion*, which is neither *God*, nor the *Creature*, or *Motion*. But this is commonly and justly rejected, as feigning a *third sort of Entity* between *God* and the *Creature*, which it passeth the wit of Man to conceive of what it should be.

✧ And if God do *immediately per essentiam*, cause that *middle Entity*, or *Action*, or *Force*, which

he faith is *no Creature*, why may he not as well immediately *per essentiam*, cause the *Creature* and *motion* it self? This therefore cannot be the thing meant by *Grace* in this Question.

To question the sufficiency of God's Essence is intolerable: To question the sufficiency of a *mediate divine Efflux* or *Action*, which is between God and the Creature and Effect, is to dispute in your *Dream* of a *Chimera*, an unproved, and a disproved, and commonly-denied Entity. To dispute of the *sufficiency* of Angels, Scripture, Sermons, &c. to work *Grace*, is not the thing commonly intended in this Controversie of *Grace*: Each several sort of *means* may be *sufficient* in its own kind and to *its own use*; but no one of them is sufficient to the effect. But if you will put the Question as of *All together*, it must be so explained.

§. 35. III. The *Grace* therefore meant in this Question can be no other than either *some effect* on the *Soul*, as tending to a *further effect*, or the *afore-said comprehension of necessary extrinseck means*. If the former be meant (as it is by almost all Schoolmen and Disputers of this Case) then, 1. It must be enquired, *Whether such a thing be?* and, 2. *What it is if it be?*

§. 36. 1. *Bradwardine*, and some that go his way, do deny the being of any such thing as we now dispute of; and say, That *God's essential will*, as a *will*, is the *immediate Efficient*, and the *Act of Man* is the *Effect*, (e. g. *Faith*,) and because God willeth that *Act*, it doth immediately exist, as the *World* did, by his creating will: And so here is no place for the Dispute of *Sufficient Grace*: For *God's Will* is certainly *sufficient* to cause what he will cause: And *Man's Act* either is *existent* or *not*:
And

And there is no Grace antecedent to it, to be called insufficient, unless you will vainly say, that Gods essential Will is sufficient to nothing but what he produceth, which is a Dispute unfit for sober men.

§. 37. 2. But because the contrary Opinion is far more common, that there is an inward *Grace* (i. e. g. to believe or consent) antecedent to our Act, whose sufficiency is questioned, it poseth the Wits of all the Schoolmen (much more is it above many Contenders that never so much as studied it) to say, what it is. The Notions of *Alvarez* (who calls it *motus*) and of *Vasquez*, and others I have elsewhere considered, and here pass by: And I have shewed, that I take it to be so far past man's reach, as to be unfit for hot Contention. But so far as we may conceive of it, it must be in this twofold notion: 1. As it is some *Divine Impress* on the Soul, which is Analogous to the *Vis impressa* received from the Mover in the Patient in corporal Motion. 2. That this *Impression* received, doth in *primo instanti*, put the Faculty into such an immediate *Ability* to the Act, or such a state of *Disposedness* to the Act, as may be called a *Moral Power* (the natural Faculty being supposed) and puts the Will in such a state as to the act of Consent, as that it *can* do it, but is not necessitated to it, nor actually determined, but *can* forbear. And this is called *sufficient Grace*. 3. And in the next instant when the Will doth consent, God and Man are both *Causes* or *Agents*, and the Grace is *effectual* by both Causes, God the first, and Man the second.

§. 38. 2. The *Pelagians* and some others seem to think that God doth not operate immediately on
mans

mans Soul, as to *proximity of Causation*, but immediately on *superiour Causes and Means* (as *Angels, Word, Objects, &c.*) and that when all means are duly ordered, man may be said to be able in his meer *natural powers* for the Act, because those means are now *Grace sufficient to excite it*. And that when one *Means* of an hundred is wanting, it is insufficient *Grace*.

§. 39. We all confess, that God worketh by means, and we cannot name an Act on us, which he always or ordinarily doth without *any means*, or second Cause. And we acknowledge that there are *gracious means*, and that ordinarily these must have a sufficiency in their kind: But withal we must say, that God worketh immediately as to proximity of Causation, when he worketh not so immediately as without second Causes: And that whether by *means*, or *without means* (as he pleaseth) there must be such a *Disposition* communicated to a depraved, undisposed Soul, as shall be a *moral power*, and put it into an immediate capacity to consent (or act): And to dispute the sufficiency of the *means*, is one thing, and to dispute the *sufficiency* of this inward *Disposition* or *Power*, is another. And this must be the question.

§. 40. The common disputed question is, Whether all men have *Grace sufficient to believe*? which must be negatively answered; They have not. Those that never heard the Gospel, have not.

§. 41. But, 2. have all that *hear the Gospel* sufficient *Grace* to believe? *Ans.* No: many of them are hardened by former sinning, so as to be set at a greater distance and enmity, than many Heathens.

§. 42. But, 3^{ly}. All the World hath Grace (or merciful Help) sufficient to enable them to do *less evil*, and *more good* than they do, and to use *some means* better than they do, which tend to further Grace. And they that do not this, are justly denied further Help.

§. 43. 4. But the sticking difficulty is, *Whether any men in the World have Grace sufficient to repent and believe savingly, who do not?* To which I answer, 1. The Question is of less moment than it's commonly made to be; seeing those are unexcusable who use not that Grace which was sufficient to their forefaid *use of means*, and less resistance to God's Grace: 2. But certainly to answer the question negatively or affirmatively, I cannot; as not knowing any more of Gods working on mens Souls, than he himself hath told us of. 3. But if we may conjecture upon Probabilities, it seemeth to me most likely, that *there is such a sufficient Grace or Power to repent and believe savingly in some* that use it not, but perish. For, 1. if *Angels had, and used* such a sort of Grace: 2. And if *Adam* had such a sort of Grace, and used it a while: 3. And if *unregenerate* men have such a *grace* for lower Acts, which tend to Faith: 4. And if the *Faithful* have *such a grace* to do more good, and less evil than they do: 5. It seemeth very improbable, that only to the fifth Instance (to repent and believe) none in the World should have such a *sufficient grace*.

§. 44. And though *Jansenius* seem very singular in denying that there is now any such *sufficient grace of Christ* in the World, which is not effectual either to believe, or to do any other good; that is, *That Christ's grace enableth no man to do any more good*

good than he doth; yet indeed it is most in *two ambiguous Words*, that *Jansenius* differeth from others, (though many unskilful Disputants suppose it to be much more material a difference) viz. 1. In one Syllable [G O O D.] For he will call nothing good in man's Actions, but *Holy Love and its Effects*; and so saith, That no unsanctified Man *doth good*, and therefore hath not Grace sufficient to do it. But moral [*Good*] is taken in three Sences (or Degrees) 1. *Good, secundum quid*, in a degree not predominant: And so Infidels and ungodly Christians have some good. 2. *Good, secundum quid, vel imperfectum*, but in a degree predominant. And so the Godly do good, though mixt with evil. 3. Good in perfection and unmixt with evil; and so none do good till they are perfected in Glory. (To say nothing of [*essential simple Good per se, and independant*;] for so none is good but God only.) And all this is the Effect of Grace.

See of this my Discourse of Saving Faith.

S. 45. 2. But, saith *Jansenius*, there is some grace which is not *gratia Christi*, the grace of Christ; and such is all that cometh from meer fear without Love, which is a kind of providential preparatory grace, but not the grace of Christ. Ans. It is not that eminent and special grace of Christ: But to think that it befalleth men without Christ's procurement, and is not a commoner sort of Christ's grace, when all Power in Heaven and Earth is put into his Hand, and he is made Head over all things to the Church, is below a Christian Divine to imagine; and too injurious to Christ. But by all this it appeareth, that even *Jansenius* differeth from others more about the Names of [*Good*] and [*Christ's Graces*] than about the Matter.

C H A P. XIV.

Of Mans Power and Free-will since the Fall.

§. 1. **S**O much is said, Chap. 9. of Mans *natural Power and Free-will*, and so much now, Chap. 13. of *grace*, and the Power given by it, as may allow me to be short in what is here to be added.

§. 2. All that *natural Power and Liberty* which was essential to the Will, remaineth in it since the Fall : For Man is of the same Species.

§. 3. The Will is still a *self-determining Principle*, supposing, 1. God's necessary Influx, as he is the first Cause of Nature, 2. And the Being and convenient Position of Objects, 3. And the Perception of the Intellect, 4. And the concurrence of necessary concomitant second Causes.

§. 4. The three Faculties of mans Soul are all vitiated by sin. 1. The *vital active Power* is so far dead to God and Holiness, as to need the cure of *quickening*, and *strengthening*, and *exciting Grace*. 2. The Intellect is so far *blinded*, as to need the cure of *illuminating grace*. 3. And the Will is so far turned by Enmity from God, to the inordinate Love of *carnal self-interest* and Creatures, as to need the cure of *converting, sanctifying Grace*.

§. 5. Grace healeth the Will of this Enmity and vicious perverseness, so far as it prevaieth ; which is, 1. common Grace enableth it to common good, and prepareth it for better. 2. Special Grace causeth it actually and habitually to will and love
speci-

special Good ; that is, God as God, and the Creature for God, and Holiness as his Image. 3. Perfecter Grace bringeth up the Will to perfecter holy Acts and Habits.

§. 6. Nature it self is not in lapsed man, divested of all *moral* or Divine Principles, Abilities, and Inclinations: In the Intellect there are *common Notices of a Deity* ; that is, That there is *one God* who is *infinitely powerful, wise, and good*: And in the *Will* there are some Inclinations still to *good as good*, and therefore to *God as far as he is truly conceived of as good* ; and so far as that conception is not conquered by a cross Conception of some Enmity : And so of other Good.

§. 7. *Nature and common Grace* may cause a man to go as far in Love and Religion, as those whom we call the *highest Hypocrites*, or *almost-Christians* may do (which our practical Preachers do frequently tell the People at large in Books and Sermons.

§. 8. Such may have a common sort of *Faith* in Christ (even formerly to the working of Miracles), and of *Repentance*, and *Reformation*, and of *good Desires*, and *love to goodness and good Men* ; yea, to God himself.

§. 9. For men are not so corrupt by *Nature* (much less under the Effects of *common grace*) as to hate *all goodness*, or to hate all that is in God: They may *love God* as he is the Almighty Creator, Preserver, and Natural-Orderer of the World, and the Cause of its Being, Motion, Beauty, Harmony, and all natural Good : And they may love him as he is the *Giver of life*, and all natural Blessings to themselves, and as he is the Preserver of them, and their only Security and Help in Danger, and not only

only as his Blessings gratifie their Senses, but as all their Hope of everlasting Happiness is in his Power and Love : They may love him as he doth this good to others also, and is the common Benefactor to the World, without whom it could not subsist a moment. And they may love him as he maketh such Laws as preserve their lives, and Properties, and Rights, from Fraud and Violence, and by making other Men conscionable, just, and charitable to all, do both gratifie themselves, and tend to the common Order, Peace, and Welfare of Societies, and of Mankind.

§. 10. I am not able to confute or deny what *Adrian* (afterwards *Pope*) hath written (in his *Quodlibets*) That an unsanctified Man (not in a state of Salvation) may so far love God, even above himself, as to consent rather to die, and be annihilated, than (were it possible) God should be annihilated, or not be God. For a Heathen might consent to die for his Country : And he is a Beast and no Man, that would not rather be annihilated, than all the World, yea, or all the Kingdom, or all the City should be annihilated, or than the Sun should cease to be, or to shine. And he that knoweth that if there were no God, there could be no World, no Being, Motion, Knowledge, Goodness, or Felicity in the World ; besides, that which is worse, the Cessation of the Infinite Good himself ; must be yet more unmanly, if he would not rather be annihilated alone (if *per impossibile*, you suppose he could live alone) than all this greater Evil should come to pass. He that tells men, that they shall be saved, if they would rather be annihilated, than that there should be no God, doth make them a promise which God hath not made.

§. 11. But (as the same Author observeth) that which the unholy cannot do, is, to *love God as God*, as the *ultimate Object*, and *most amiable Good* to be known, and by *Love and Holiness* enjoyed, and pleased by a *holy Soul*; and this above all sensual terrene Delights, and to love him as the holy Ruler of the World, who forbiddeth all sinful sensuality, and all mens inordinate Conceits, Desires, Delights, and Practices, and requireth holiness and purity of Mind, and Life, and Sobriety, and Temperance, and Self-denial in all that will be saved. And as he is a just Judge who will execute all these Laws, and condemn the ungodly to endless Misery. They love not God, as he is the *holy Governour*, and *righteous Judge* of men, that would restrain them from their sinful Wills and Pleasures, and damn them if they will not be holy. And consequently they love not his Laws, and other means by which this is to be done: Because *loving the pleasure* of their *Lusts*, and being averse to things spiritual, high and holy, they love not that holiness and rectitude in themselves, which God commandeth, *Rom. 8. 5, 6, 7, 8, &c.*

§. 12. Though God, as the Fountain of Nature, continue the natural power and liberty of the Will, yet its *moral Impotency*, *Pravity*, or ill *Disposition*, by which it is *averse* to Holiness; and prone to Sensuality, must be cured by Grace; where *common Grace* and *special*, cause *common* and *special Effects* in the Cure.

§. 13. The moral Power given by Grace, consisting in the *right Disposition* of the Will, is not of the same kind with the *Natural Power* or *Faculty*: And the Words [CAN] and [CANNOT] used of both sorts, have not the same signification,

but

but are equivocal ; otherwise *Sin* and *Grace* should change mans *Species*. Those Disputants therefore that confound them for the *sounds sake*, deceive the Auditors.

§. 14. We must say then, That *quoad vires, vel potentiam naturalem*, every man can believe, who hath the use of *Reason*, *Objects revealed*, and extrinseck necessary Causes ; that is, He wanteth not the *natural Faculty* or *Power*, nor needeth another *natural Faculty*, but only the *Excitation*, *Illumination*, and *right Disposition* of that which he hath : But as to the said *right Disposition*, or *moral Power*, no one can truly repent and believe without that *Grace* which must so dispose him : Common *Grace* must dispose him to a common Faith, and special *Grace* to a saving Faith.

§. 15. It is more proper to say, That an Unbeliever, and unholy Sinner will not repent and believe, than that he cannot ; though that also may be truly said, if well explained. But the meaning is not, that he cannot, though he sincerely would : Nor yet that he cannot be willing, for want of the *natural Power* of willing ; But, 1. That he hath a *Logical*, and, 2. A *moral Impotency* ; that is, an *Indisposition* ; he wanteth both *Disposition*, *Habit*, and *Act*, but not the *Faculty*.

§. 16. It is an abusive miscarriage of those Disputants, who in the Words [*CAN*] and [*CANNOT*] use to confound not only, as aforesaid, *natural* and *moral Power*, but even *Logical* also, which is *neither*, and signifieth no more but that *in ordine probandi* ; such *Premises* being put, the *Conclusion Can* or *Cannot* follow : For so it may be truly said, That no man can do, *Speak*, or think any other than he doth ; and nothing can ever come

to pass, but what *doth* come to pass; even from Gods fore-knowledge this will follow: For seeing nothing ever will be otherwise than God foreknoweth it will be, a Disputant will say, *It can be no otherwise*; but he must only mean that *posita prae-science divina*, the Conclusion cannot be true, that the Event will be otherwise: when yet as to the nature of Causation, we must say, *sensu physico & morali*, that it *Can be otherwise* oft-times, though it will not be otherwise.

§. 17. These things considered, it appeareth that we are commonly agreed as followeth: 1. That all Men have natural Powers and Free-will to good, even spiritual good; that is, Whenever such good is chosen or willed, it is done by the natural Power or Faculty; and when it is not willed, it is not for want of a natural Faculty, but its due Disposition.

§. 18. 2ly. That as to Civil or Law-power and Liberty, all men have much more than Liberty granted them by God to repent and believe. For Helps and a Command are more than Leave or Liberty: But Liberty from the Penalty for sin, belongeth only to the pardoned.

§. 19. 3ly. That as to Ethical Power and Liberty, which lieth in a right Disposition of mans Faculties, every man hath it so far as Grace hath prevailed, and wrought it in him, and none any further.

§. 20. Or as Liberty is denominated from the Evil which we are free from, 1. All mens wills are free from being constrained to sin, 1. By natural inclination of the faculties themselves; 2. Or by the senses; 3. Or by Objects; 4. Or by Men; 5. Or by Devils; 6. Or by God: Because the rest cannot and

and God will not ; no, not physically premove and predetermine it thereto.

§. 21. 2. The wills of all men are free from any *Commands to Sin* : that is, God cannot command it (for else it were no Sin) and if men command it, their *Commands* are null, and lay no obligation on the will to obey them.

§. 22. 3. We are free from sinful *Dispositions* so far as Grace freeth us, and no further : Therefore by common Grace men have common Liberty, and by special Grace saving Liberty ; but none perfect Liberty here ; and no unsanctified man hath *saving Liberty of Will* : that is, such by which he is duly disposed to such acts as have a flat Promise of Salvation : And where now doth our difference remain ?

§. 23. *Obj.* The difference is, *Whether a bad man can change his own will ?* *Ans.* Your [*can*] meaneth the *natural Power*, or the *due disposition* : As to the first, *he can*, that is, he hath those faculties which want not *natural Power* to act better : But as to the latter, *he cannot without Grace*, that is, through indisposition he will not.

§. 24. *Q.* But is not Grace the only cause of the Change ? *Ans.* Grace only causeth the first Impulse on the Soul, which moveth it to act ; but the Soul (or will) it self is a Cause of the Act, else it were not Man but GOD that doth repent, believe, obey, &c.

§. 25. *Q.* But is it Grace or Free-will that is the chief Cause ? *Ans.* Grace no doubt : Which is commonly acknowledged by the several Parties.

§. 26. The very marrow then of all the question about the Power and Liberty of the *Will*, is that so often before mention'd, Whether Man's

Will be made of G O D such a self-determining Power, as *can truly do any more good than it doth, or forbear more evil, without any more Grace from God, than that which it hath while it doth no more* : And whether ever the Will can and do make a various use of the same degree of Divine Assistance : And this as is said, is confessed of the Angel's Case and Adam's : For if Adam had not Power to have stood when he fell, by the same Grace that was given him, but fell because God withdrew or withheld such necessary Grace without which he could do no other than he did, we may then lay by these Controversies, and think how to answer Infidels.

§. 27. Those persons that make others odious by their revilings, for *holding Free-will, or denying Free-will*, without telling men what Freedom it is that they mean (*natural, ethical, legal or logical, Freedom from Coaction, necessitating Premotion, natural Inclination, or vicious Disposition, &c.*) should be rebuked by the Lovers of Truth and Peace, as the Peace-breakers of the Church and World, that presume in their proud ignorance to reproach others for that which they understand not.

§. 28. They that say, That the Liberty of the Will as natural is not violated, but by *Coaction*, and that *Coaction*, is nothing but making a man *will against his Will* in the same respect and act, and so that to *will* and to *will freely* is all one, and that to *will* by *Coaction* is a contradiction, *viz.* to *will* and *nil* the same, and that God predetermineth all mens wills to all sinful habits and acts in *specie* as circumstantiated, by immediate, necessitating or irresistible premotion, and yet taketh not away their Liberty, because he maketh their *will* and

and not *nil* the sin. These do but play with the name of *Free-will*, and are confuted as aforesaid from the instance of *Adam*, and from the scope of Scripture, and do subvert the Foundations of Christianity. To *will* is the proper act of *my will*; and if he that moveth me by prime physical efficiency to will the circumstantiated act of Sin, deprive me not of my Liberty, because it is *willing* that he maketh me do, then if Men or Devils had Power to make me *will Sin*, as I cause my Pen to write, or the Fire to burn this or that, it would be no loss of Liberty. But of this more largely elsewhere.

C H A P. XV.

Of Effectual Grace, and how God giveth it.

§. 1. **A**S I said before about Sufficient Grace, so here about *Effectual*; the first thing to be done by Disputers, is, to agree what that is which they here call [*Grace*] as the Subject of the Question. And as I there shewed, 1. It cannot or must not be God's *essential Will or Power*, for that is simple and immutable, and not in it self (save *relatively*) distinguishable into *sufficient* and *effectual*. 2. An *Efflux* or *vis*, which is neither God nor the Effect, there is *none*, or none proveable. 3. It is not *Faith* it self that is meant here by Grace, for it is the Grace *that effecteth Faith*; and it were absurd to ask what Faith is effectual to make or cause it self: This is true both of the Act and Habit. The meaning is not, what *Habit*

N 3

of

of Faith is effectual to the Act, nor what Act to the Habit or it self, but what *Grace of God* is effectual to *cause both Act and Habit*. 4. Therefore there is nothing left to be meant by Grace, but the two things before mentioned, viz. 1. The *gracious Means* or *second Causes* appointed by God to cause our Faith. 2. The first *moving Impress*

* *Some say, that God's meer will causeth man's act, as willing it, without any*

other Influx or Impress on Man's Will, save our Act it self effectual: But though it be only God's essential will, which is the first Cause, yet the thing received by us from God seemeth to be a certain Impress, Impulse, or vis, or Disposition to act in order of Nature, before the act it self, which Impress sometime is made uneffectual by a prevalent Indisposition or Resistance of the Will.

on the Soul, as it is antecedent to Act and Habit, (supposing that such there is, * though some deny that there is any such thing.)

§. 2. And for the first, *all means* will be uneffectual without God's inward Operation by his Spirit: He must work on the Speaker and on the Hearer, to make means effectual, as is agreed on. But whether as God worketh in *Naturals* according to the *aptitude of natural second Causes*, so he work Faith and other *Graces* by a *settled proportion of Concourse*, agreeable to the *Aptitude of gracious second Causes* (or Means of Grace) is a Question too hard to be boldly and peremptorily determined by us that are in so much darkness.

§. 3. But it seemeth to us, that God would not have made it so great a part of his Government to establish a *Course of Means*, if he did not intend to work *ordinarily by them*, and according to their fitness. *Christ* is the *chief Means*, and instituteth the rest; *Scripture, Ministers, Example, good Com-*

Company, merciful Providences, Afflictions, Meditation, Books, Prayer, Sacraments, &c. are all appointed for such effects: And if God would *ordinarily* work *immediately without means*, what need all these? This teacheth Infidels to say, that he may do it *without Christ*. The Spirit first indited the Word (as we cut a Seal to be the instrument of Impression) and then by that word doth work on Souls.

§. 4. But if God did tie himself not only *ordinarily*, but *always* to *apt means*, no mortal could say *what means* is *sufficient*, and what is *insufficient*, and what is *more than sufficient*, even *necessarily efficacious*: For the *means*, 1. are very many and more than we can take notice of; and if *one* be wanting, it may render the rest insufficient or uneffectual, how excellent soever in themselves. 2. And that means is fitted to *one* Hearer that is not fitted to *another*: All have not the same temptations, hindrances, prejudices, objections, weaknesses, nor obstinacy: And God only knoweth when *means* are adequately fitted to the desired effect upon mens Souls.

§. 5. And though *many* of the means operate *ex parte sui*, *necessarily*, yet so do not *all*: For *Preachers* and *Instructors* are *free Agents*, and so it must be *other effectual means* that must first move them to do *their Duty* for a Sinner's good: Which who can judge of?

§. 6. But God is the *Arbitrary Absolute Lord* of *all means*, and therefore he can change and dispose of them as he pleases, and yet *work by them*. So that the Effect is nevertheless from God's free or arbitrary Volition, though he never went beyond the aptitude of means: When even a silly

man can turn the natural course of Water and Wind to move his Mill or Sails at his pleasure, without any alteration of their natures : A Fisher can use his Bait as may serve his end ; and a Physician can vary his Medicines to cure the Disease without changing their *nature*, or curing *without them*.

§. 7. But there is no question but God can work *without means*, and *Intellectual Souls* being so near to the *first Cause*, it is utterly uncertain to us, whether in Works of Grace God have not a double operation on the Soul, one by his appointed *means*, and another by *immediate influx* * ; and if it be so, how these concur to one and the same effect, and also how God doth immediately move Souls, are all past Man's reach, and should be acknowledged above our Disputes.

* *Though before I shewed that this seemed not necessary to all acts of Man, & will not overthrow Durand.*

§. 8. II. God hath more inward operations on Man's Soul than one or two (whether with means or without) to bring us to Faith and Repentance : The *mind* must be *enlightened*, the *dull faculties* must be *excited*, especially *Conscience* and *Will*, and the *Will* must be touched with the gust of *Divine Love* to breed a holy *Complacency* in good, and many *Impediments* must be removed, some by outward acts of Providence, and some by inward Grace. And where *Impediments* are not removed, no doubt but there needeth more of the other Acts of Grace, to bring such a Soul to Faith and Repentance, than in one where there is less resistance.

§. 9. And

§. 9. And seeing that *Recipitur ad modum recipientis*, and the disposition of the Recipient hath so great a hand as common Experience telleth us in almost all the Changes in the World, (what wonderful variety of Effects doth the same Action of the Sun produce throughout the World, by the diversity of *receptive dispositions*)? Therefore no mortal man can say when the efficacy or success of Divine Grace is more to be ascribed to the *Preparatory Disposition* of the Recipient by a former act of Grace, and when more to the *present moving Influx*? nor what *proportion* these alwaies bear as comparable. And what man dare say that he can search out the waies of God?

§. 10. When we know so little of the secret Energies of *natural Principles*, nor how God produceth *Animals* in the Womb, nor how he causeth our Food to nourish us, nor how any of our Senses do their Office, nor how our Souls do use the Corporeal Spirits, &c. And when Christ hath told us, That *the Wind bloweth where it listeth, and we hear the sound of it, but know not whence it cometh, and whither it goeth*; and so is he that is born of the Spirit, *Joh. 3. 8.* Should not this, with the experience and consciousness of our Ignorance, suffice to keep us from bitter Contendings about that which is certainly beyond our reach, and from presumptuous boldness with the unsearchable things of God?

§. 11. Whether you will with *Bradwardine* and many others say, That it is God's meer *Volition* that effecteth all things *ad extra*; or whether you will say with the most, That it is not his *Will alone*, but his *Will* as operating by his *executive Power*, the meaning seemeth to be the same

same, and the difference to be but notional, as is aforesaid : For they that speak in the first manner, mean, That it is not God's Will as in it self immanently considered, but his will as going forth to produce an effect ; which emanation or exertion is, from the effect, called by those that speak in the second manner, *God's Executive Power*.

§. 12. The prime Reason of the Effect, is God's *Wisdom, Will, and Power* as the Cause : And so the prime reason why Means and Grace become effectual whenever they are effectual, must be from God the prime Cause.

§. 13. The first Impress on the Soul moving it toward the Act (*e. g. Faith*) is the first Grace internal (*sub ratione effecti*) : And this God himself worketh on man as on a *meer Patient* ; tho' not antecedently to all former acts of Man, or all preparative dispositions, (usually) yet antecedent to that Act of Man to which it moveth : So that as to this, 1. Man is passive, 2. and the Divine Operation (or the *powerful Will of God*) is not only sufficient but effectual ; for that Impress or *Motus* is effected.

§. 14. Though God being a *Spirit* moveth not by such Contact as *Bodies* do on each other, yet must we conceive of his motion, and the motion of all *Spirits on Bodies*, as *analogous* to corporeal Contact, and as a motion by Efflux and eminent Contact of Virtue and Essence, according to the more excellent nature and operation of Spirits ; or else we cannot conceive positively of them.

§. 15. It is already proved, that God useth various degrees of Impress or Motion on Souls ; of which some do by their proper power or degree so ascertain the effect, that the Argument is alwaies good

good as a *causa*, [where-ever God doth so move, there the Effect (that is the Act, e. g. Faith or Consent) followeth; And this Grace is effectual *ex propria vi vel virtute*: But that God sometime operateth by a *less Impress* or *Motion*, which doth not from its own force inferr the effect, but so far disposeth the Mind or Will to the Act, that the man can do it without any more grace; which is it that is called *Sufficient Grace*, as aforesaid.

§. 16. It is a thing not to be believed, that this latter degree of Divine motion is never eventually effectual to the Act: Seeing, 1. it is granted, that there is such a Power in Man's Will as can act in some cases by that degree of Grace called *Sufficient*: And *frustra fit potentia quæ nunquam reducitur in actum*. 2. And it's granted, that the Angels and Adam did act by such help. Therefore as to acts preparatory before special Faith, few do affirm that they are all done by such Grace as is necessarily effectual *ex propria vi* alone, but that *sufficient Grace* leaveth them often to Man's Will.

§. 17. Therefore all that remaineth, is to resolve what is the reason of the certain effect when we believe? To which I say, 1. It is ever an effect of two Causes (at least) God's motion and man's faculty, and so both must be said to be the Cause of the effect. 2. But man's will is no Cause (save a recipient Cause) of God's Part or Impress. 3. God sometimes, at least, maketh so powerful an Impress, as doth necessarily determine man's will, by a Necessity consistent with his Liberty. 4. It cannot be proved by any man, that no man believeth by that *sufficient Motion*, which doth not necessarily determine his will; seeing many preparatory

ratory acts are done by such a motion. And it's probable that it is oft so. §. But the certainty of this, or when and how oft it is so, no man can know.

§. 18. But by which degree of Grace soever the effect be produced, still God's Will is the *chief cause* of it ; which can procure the effect *infallibly*, when it doth not *necessitate* : Yea, and his *premotion* or *impress* called *Sufficient*, is incomparably more the cause than Man's Concourse is ; though God leave some part of the Causation to man's Free-will.

§. 19. But when the Effect doth not follow, that is, when men *believe not*, it is *man's will* by *omission* and *resistance*, that is the chief cause, and culpable, and not God's omission or non-determination.

§. 20. The same degree of divine Impress or Motion, which prevaieth with a Soul predisposed by common Grace, is not enough to prevail with some others that are ill or indisposed : Though God's *Absolute Will* and *Answerable Operation* would prevail with any, how bad soever.

C H A P. XVI.

Of the State of Heathens and others, that have not the Gospel.

§. 1. **T**H E opening of the several Laws or Covenants of God before, hath taken up most that is necessary to be said about this point :

point : The question, Whether any but *Christians* are saved, is agitated on both sides by so much the sharper Censures, by how much the nearer it seemeth to concern the Fundamentals of Religion.

§. 2. On one side some say, That nothing is more fundamental than *God's Nature*, and *Government*, and *Beneficence*, and the Attributes which belong to him in respect to each : And they say, That for God to be the *Ruler* and *Benefactor* of the World, and to be also *Exod. 34. 5,*
gracious and merciful and Love it self, 6, 7.
and a Rewarder of them that diligently Heb. 11. 6.
seek him, are our Fundamentals ; which are not consistent with this, That all the World since *Adam*, except a few Believers or Jews and Christians, that were born from *Adam*, under as *absolute a necessity* of being remedilessly damned, as of dying.

§. 3. Here they use first to consider of the *number*, viz. 1. That it is not past the *sixth part* of the World that are called *Christians*. 2. That the *far greatest part* of these (perhaps twenty to one) have not competent *means* to understand *what that Christianity* is which giveth them their name, and which, as to the *name*, they profess. The *Circassians*, *Mengrelians*, and other *Georgians*, the *Armenians*, the *Muscovites*, the *Cossacks*, the most of the *Greeks* and *Abassines*, yea and *Papists*, besides the *Coptics*, *Syrians*, *Nestorians*, *Jacobites*, *Maronites*, *Christians of St. Thomas*, &c. and too many *Protestants* are bred up in so great ignorance, that multitudes of them never are sufficiently taught to understand the *Essentials* of the Christian Religion which they (nominally) profess ; and therefore
 are

are really much in the case of common Heathens.

§. 4. 2. They consider their *impossibility of being saved* : For it is not only *morally* (by Vice) but *naturally impossible to believe* that which was never heard, read or understood : So that their Damnation seemeth unavoidable, especially to such as live in the vast Countries of *America*, and much of *Africa* and *Asia*, that are quite out of the reach of any Instructions for the Christian Faith.

§. 5. 3. And lastly, they consider the *goodness* and *mercifulness* of God, declared in his Word, and in his great and manifold mercies to all the World, and that he would have a righteous man to be merciful even to his *Beast*, much more to the *Bodies of Men*, and most of all to their *Souls*, and that our Rule and Motive is, *Be merciful as your Heavenly Father is merciful*.

§. 6. And they think that the contrary-minded, by *over-doing*, are the greatest Hinderers of the *Christian Faith*, and Promoters of *Infidelity*, while they make it seem so contrary to *God's own Attributes*, and to *humane Interest*, and to be a Doctrine not of glad but of *saddest* tydings to Mankind, viz. That none shall be saved that hear not the Gospel, when it is few comparatively that ever heard it or can hear it.

§. 7. On the other side it is thought a dangerous *undermining of Christianity*, to say that it is

A ^{ct} . 13. 48.	not <i>absolutely necessary to Salvation</i> ,
Mark 16. 16.	and that any besides <i>Christians</i> may
Joh. 3. 36.	be saved : And it seemeth to them to
Joh. 14. 6.	be contrary to Christ's words, that <i>He</i>
Ro. 10. 10. &c.	
Mat. 11. 27. Luk. 10. 22.	Mat. 16. 17. Rom. 1. 16, 17.
1 Cor. 2. 10, &c.	2 Cor. 4. 3. Rom. 8. 1, 9, 13. Luk. 19. 10.

that believeth not, shall be damned; and that He is the way, the truth, and the life, and no man cometh to the Father, but by him. And how shall they call on him on whom they have not believed, &c.? No man knoweth the Father, but the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal him, &c. And it seemeth to confound the Church and the World, to say, That any are saved out of the Church.

§. 8. In this great Controversie, that which must satisfie us, is to agree in so much as is certain, and to leave that which is uncertain and unknown, undetermined: For we shall know it never the more for a confident pretending that we know it, when we do not.

§. 9. And here the first thing to be enquired after, is, *What Law of God the World that heareth not of Christ, is now under, as the Rule of Duty and of Judgment.* And then, 2. to enquire, *Whether they so keep that Law, as to be saved by it?* We can say nothing to the second, without the first.

§. 10. And we have here nothing to doubt of, but, 1. *whether they are under any Law or none?* 2. *If any, Whether it be the Law of Innocency as made to Adam, or the Law of Grace?* 3. *And if the Law of Grace, whether of the first or second Edition?* It must be one of these.

§. 11. And, 1st. It is certain, That they are under a Law (and not only under a Physical Government, as a Ship at Sea, or Brutes are): For else God were not their Ruler, and they his Subjects, so much as by Right and Obligation; and then they were bound to no Duty, nor in hope of any Reward, nor in Danger of any Punishment for Diso-

Disobedience: For *where there is no Law, there is no Transgression.*

§. 12. It is certain, That they are *not under the Rule of the Covenant of Innocency made to Adam, or the Law of Innocency, as containing the Precept, premiant and penal parts, which is the same with the Covenant as offered.* This I proved before: (Though I was long ignorant how far that Covenant was repealed, till Mr. *Lawson's* Papers (which I laboured to confute) did begin to enlighten me.) God now saith to no man [*I give thee life on condition thou be personally innocent, and perfectly obedient:*] Nor doth he say [*I command thee to be perfectly innocent, sinless, and obedient, that thou mayst live:*] For no man is a Subject capable of such a Command or Promise, being already a Sinner.

§. 13. If any should think that they are under the *bare preceptive part of the Law of Innocency, with the penal part, without any Promise, or premiant part, or hope of life, this is certainly a mistake.*

Because, 1. God hath no such Law, nor never had, which hath no *Promise, or premiant part*; and is not in a *Covenant-form*, what he doth by the *Devils*, belongeth not to our Question; but as to Men, they must be under a *Covenant of Works, or of Grace.* And it were a hard Conceit to think, that the far greatest part of Mankind had *never any means to use for their Salvation, nor any thing to do for it, but were under a meer Sentence of Despair and Damnation, as the Devils are, without any offer of Help or Hope*; and consequently that none of them all are *guilty of refusing any such Mercy, or neglecting any such Means and Duty.*

2. The

2. The very nature of *Law and Government* tell us, That if God command any Duty, it is that the Subject may be the *better for it*; and he never saith to any [*obey me perfectly, and thou shalt be never the better for it.*]

§. 14. Besides, the very *Precept* is not in force in that sence as it stood in the *Law of Innocency*; for so it bound only *innocent Man* to keep his *Innocency*: But God saith not, *Keep that which thou hast lost.*

§. 15. Obj. *God is not bound to change his Law, if man sin.*

Ans. I answered this before, That God is not the Changer: But the Law will not continue to be a Law, but by continuing to signifie God's governing Will: And it cannot so signifie his governing Will, when there is no Subject to be a capable *terminus*: So that it ceased, *cessante capacitate subditi, vel cessante termino*. To say, That the Law still signifieth what God would have had man do while he was capable, is true; but that saith no more but that [*It was once a Law, and now is none:*] For so it may do by the dead, yea, were they annihilated, even tell others what God would have had them do, but this is not a ruling Act; but *Lex transit in sententiam*. And to say, That at least the Law binderh a Sinner to perfect Obedience for the time to come, is to say, That it binds not as the Law of Innocency, but as some other Law, of which we are enquiring.

§. 16. And it is a clear Truth (before proved) That God brought all Mankind in Adam under a Law and Covenant of Grace, founded in the Promise of the Victory of the Woman's Seed: And his dealing with all men ever since, doth fully confirm

it. And this Law made to Mankind in *Adam* and *Noah*, was never repealed to the World, but perfected by a perfecter Edition to those that have the Gospel. Therefore we have two Questions here to consider. 1. *What Law the World was under before Christ's Incarnation: And, 2. whether Christ repealed it to them?*

§. 17. 1st. And it is proved, That on God's part the said Law of Grace continued: And man's *Disobedience* could not here nullify the Law, as it did that of Innocency: Because it was a Law that allowed Repentance till the time of Death: So that when they sinned never so much, they were still obliged by it to *repent*, that they might be saved. Their Rebellion deprived them of the Benefit, but did not end the Law, nor rendered them incapable of its Obligation. God made *Adam*, and after him the Heads of Families his Priests: He had then publick Worship natural, and instituted sacrificing, and the distinction of clean and unclean Beasts, Sabbath and Marriage, as well as calling on the Name of the Lord, are expressed: As the Covenant to *Noah* was the same with that to *Adam*, with some small Addition, so no doubt were the Precepts of *Noah*. As the *Canaanites* sacrificed, so their marrying in the prohibited Degrees, is called one of their Abominations: It's very probable, that not only the Decalogue in fence; but also all, or most of the particular Mo-
saical Precepts, which are but the Instances, Ex-
plications, and Applications of those Generals, were given before the Flood; and some more, which even the Nations Traditions kept some remembrance of, though not named particularly in the Text.

§. 18. And it was not God's Covenant of *Peculiarity* with *Abraham* and the *Jews*, that ended it to the rest of the World (as I before proved.)

§. 19. So that though there be difficulty in opening the *Terms* of the Law of Grace, as it stood to all Mankind besides the *Jews*, there is no difficulty to prove, that it did indeed so continue.

§. 20. And that *Christ* hath not repealed or nullified that Law of Grace to the World that never have the Gospel, which they were under before his coming, is evident. 1. Because he came for the *Benefit*, and not the *Destruction* of the World, to make their Condition *better*, and not *worse*: But had he nullified that Law of Grace to all the World, and given them no better in its stead, save to a few, he had come directly by himself to take away their Mercies, and make them miserable. For it is certain, that though the Apostles Commission was to *preach the Gospel to all Nations*, and every Creature, yet it is comparatively but a small part of the World that ever heard it, or had the means to know and believe in Christ. And all the rest were under a *Law of Grace* before, and therefore are so still. 2. And if Christ repealed that Law, by which *Act* did he do it? Not by making a better Edition, for that could not have any such Effect to them that never did, or could know of that Edition: And there is no other Repeal to be found in Scripture. 3. And if the Law of Grace be nullified to all the World that hear not the Gospel, are they since under any Law of God, or none; if none, they are either *no Men*, or *damm'd Men*; for they are *no governed Subjects*: If they

O 2

are

are under any, *what is it?* The *Law of Innocency* I have proved it is not: And the *G O S P E L* (or *second Edition* of the *Law of Grace*) it is not. For that cannot oblige where it never is promulgate: It being a *supernatural Revelation*, can extend to none to whom it is not (directly or indirectly) sent: Therefore it is evident, that Christ leaveth such under that *Law* which he found them under.

§. 21. What this *Law* to the World containeth, having before opened, *Chap. 12. §. 3.* I shall not repeat it, but only here add, 1. It is certain, that though this *Law* make perfect *Obedience* for the future to be a *Duty* (to them and us) yet not to be the *Condition of Salvation*; but that it doth hereto accept sincerity. 2. That it maketh not the particular Articles of our present Creed about Christ's person, Birth, Life, Death, Resurrection, heavenly Intercession in our Nature, necessary to their *Salvation*: For before Christ's Coming, no Jewish Believers could believe, That this *Jesus*, in his demonstrable *Person*, is the *Christ*, but that *Christ* should come: And after he had long taught them, and pronounced them blessed, the Disciples knew not that he must die, rise, ascend, intercede in Heaven, come again, &c. 3. It is certain, that all that the Prophets had any way foretold of Christ to the Jews, was

Luke 24.

not of absolute necessity to Salvation to the Jews themselves to be understood, much less to the World that never heard it: For Christ proved out of the Prophets, That he was to die, and rise, and so to be glorified; when yet the Apostles had not understood it till that time. And the Jewish Believers had very dark (if

(if not erroneous) Notions of the person of the Messiah to come. And to believe that he should be of *Abraham's Seed*, as it was part of *Abraham's Covenant of Peculiarity*, so it seemeth to be necessary only to such as were under, or knew that Covenant, and not to all.

§. 22. And it is certain, that when the Messiah *was come*, they were not bound to believe that *he was yet to come* (though they knew not of his coming) because it was then an Untruth.

§. 23. The proclaimed Name of God, *Exod.* 24. with *Psal.* 19. *Prov.* 1. *Act.* 10. and 14. and 17. *Rom.* 1. and 2. *Heb.* 6. 11. do seem to be the Expositions of the true Sence and Tenour of that Law of Grace, *Gen.* 3. 15. which the World before Christ's coming, was under, and yet is, where the Gospel cannot be had.

§. 24. The Texts that say, *He that believeth not shall be damned*, plainly refer to such as hear the Word to be believed, and speak of the Unbelief of what is revealed, and not of what is unrevealed.

§. 25. *Rom.* 10. saith no more, but that no man can believe in Christ without the Revelation of him by preaching or declaring; and that no man that heareth, can be saved without believing in him, nor no man saved at all without that Faith, which the Law that he is under, maketh necessary to Salvation. But if all were damned that believed not that this Jesus is personally the Christ, all before his Incarnation must be damned: But if not all before, then the same thing was never made necessary after to all that could not possibly hear of it.

§. 26. The same I say of *Joh.* 14. 6. No man cometh to the Father, but by me. 1. No man is re-

reconciled to God, and pardoned, and hath right to life (in all Ages of the World) but for the sake of the meritorious Sacrifice and Righteousness of Christ, as promised, Gen. 3. 1. before, and performed after: But this was the part of God and our Redeemer, which he promised in his part of the Covenant, and performed: For God was in Christ reconciling the World to himself, not imputing to them their sins, (so far forgiving them, as to make an Act of Grace and Pardon, which he committed to his Ministers to proclaim,) 2 Cor. 5. 19. But, 2. on mans part it is not the knowledge and belief of this Jesus incarnate personally, that was made necessary to all before his coming, and therefore not to all after. No man ever came to the Father, but by the Son's Merit and Spirit; nor without a consenting Belief and Affiance in God's redeeming or recovering, pardoning, saving Mercy, and true Repentance, and a sanctified Soul, which is in love with God and goodness: And whatever was absolutely necessary in the terms of the first Edition of the Covenant of Grace, even to all the World before Christ's Incarnation. But Christ never meant, that no man before his Incarnation (or since, that heard not of him) did come to the Father without believing that which the Apostles themselves long believed not, after they followed Christ.

§. 27. The rest of the World were not bound to know so much of the Messiah as the Jews, as having not the same Revelation.

§. 28. 1. Having proved that it is a Law of Grace that all the World is to be ruled and judged by, it remaineth to be enquired, Whether any of them that hope not the Gospel, do keep the Conditions

of

of this Law, and so are justified by it, and saved?

To which I answer, 1. That being a matter of fact, it is not of so great Importance for us to be certain of it, as some imagine: And who can be certain of the Affirmative, unless the Scripture affirm it; when if we knew all the World, one man cannot be certain of anothers Sincerity? And much less can any be certain of the Negative, without Scripture Negation, seeing no man can know every man in the World, and every Heart.

§. 29. 2. But it is exceeding probable, at least, That God would never govern many hundred parts of the World (compared to the Jews) before Christ's Incarnation, and five sixth parts since his Incarnation, by a Law of Grace, which yet no person should ever have effectual Grace to keep as far as was necessary to his Salvation. Every Law of God is a Means, and appointeth the Subjects the use of much Means for their own Salvation: These means they are bound to use, and shall be condemned, if they use them not; and that none should ever use them savingly, is an Assertion so unlikely, that he that hath the boldness to affirm it, should bring certain Proof of it, which the Scripture, I think, doth not afford him.

§. 30. But what numbers do perform the Condition and are saved, no mortal man can tell: But in general we know, that God usually worketh in Congruity to his appointed means, and consequently that far fewer are saved where less means is vouchsafed, than among Christians who have again the invaluable pre-eminence above others.

S. 31. For as the Jews had both the common *Covenant of Grace*, and also the *Covenant of Peculiarity*, setting them above all others; so the *Christian Church* hath both the common *Covenant of Grace*, and by the second edition of it a *Covenant of Peculiarity*; both sealed by *Baptism* and the *Lord's Supper*, as the Jews *Covenant* was by *Circumcision* and the *Passover*: Yea, our *Covenant-Privileges* set us above the *World*, incomparably higher than the *Jews* were.

S. 32. Yet should we take warning by the example of the *Jews* Pride, who were so confident that none were saved or beloved but themselves, that they despised the rest of the *World*, and provoked *God* to cut them off, and call the *Gentiles* into higher privileges: So some *Christians* so trust to their *Gospel-Peculiarities*, (as the *Jews* did to their *Law*) that they despise all the *World* besides themselves, and can easilier believe that *God* will damn a thousand millions that never heard the *Gospel* than one of them, who have no more real Holiness, than many of those whom they despise. But it is our Duty to be thankful both for our excellent *Peculiarities*, and also for the commoner *Mercies* unto others.

And I wish the impartial Reader to study, *Mal.* 1. 10, 11. whether even this be not the sense, [Nor will I accept an Offering at your hand, for from the rising of the Sun to the going down of the same, my name is great among the Gentiles, and in every place Incense offered to my name, and a pure Offering: For my name is great among the Heathen, saith the Lord of hosts; but ye have polluted it.] Our Translators have, as Expositors, thrice (at the least) added the future Tense [shall be]. But all

all the old Translations, *Syriack, Caldee Paraph. Greek, Latin, &c.* put it in the present Tense [*is great, is offered.*] I do but desire the Reader to study it. It's strange, that all the ancient Churches should misunderstand it. It seems more probable by the Context that the *Hebrew* Text understood the *present Tense* (none being expressed.)

§. 33. If we might imitate our Father *Abraham* (who yet saw *Christ's* day and rejoiced) we should suppose the number of the saved through the world, to be very considerable: For as I said elsewhere, though God had told him, that *Sodom* was so much worse than the rest of the World, that God would destroy it, yet *Abraham* thought there might be fifty righteous persons there. It's like he thought not worse of the rest of the World.

§. 34. Obj. You seem to make the rest of the World happier than the Jews; for they had a Law that would justify them, and so had not the Jews.

Ans. The second assertion is false: The Jews were under the Law of Grace, which *Paul* calleth the Promise, and might be justified by it, and had greater helps to know and keep it than the rest of the World had. But when they foolishly separated their *Mosaical Law* from the Promise or common Law of Grace, *Paul* tells them, by the Deeds of that Law no flesh could be justified.

§. 35. Obj. Do you not thus confound the World and the Church? Ans. No: I ask you, Did he confound them before *Christ's* Incarnation, who thought that more than the Jews were saved? Certainly no: No more do I now.

§. 36. The word [*Church*] is sometime taken so properly and strictly, as to signify only those that

that are *under the Covenant of Peculiarity*: And so the Jews before Christ's Birth, and Christians since, make up the *Church*, (and some few perhaps before the *Jews Covenant*.) But sometimes it is taken more largely, for the Kingdom of God: For all that are in a *State of Salvation*, under the several editions of the Law of Grace. And so Job and his Friends, and Melchizedeck and many others, before, and all now that love God and Holiness sincerely, are of the Church. Accordingly by the [World] is meant, either, 1. All Men as under the Redeemer's Law of Grace, antecedently to their Consent; and so all the World belong to God's Kingdom, as *subditi obligati*. 2. Rebels that refuse Consent: And so they are of the Kingdom by obligation, but condemnable for Rebellion: And these are the [World] in the worst sense. 3. Consenting Subjects under the Common Law of Grace, who yet were not Jews, nor are not in the Covenant of Peculiarity: And such are in a *State of Salvation*, though not in the Church of the peculiar (as the Subjects of Melchizedeck, Sem, &c.) and so are both in the Church and in the World, in several senses.

§. 37. Having delivered that in this great Question which seemeth to me agreeable to God's Word, I advise those that use to assault such things with reproach, which they find reproached by their Party, to remember, that God is Love, and Christ is the Saviour of the World, and the Pharisaical Appropriators of Mercy and Salvation, do seldom know what Spirit they are of.

C H A P. XVII.

Of the Necessity of Holiness, and of Moral Virtue.

§. 1. **H**OLINESS is our *Dedication, Separation, or Devotedness to God, and alienation from all that stands in competition or contrariety to God.*

Zech. 14. 20.

21. 2 Tim.

1. 9. Heb.

3. 1. 1 Pet. 1. 15, 16. & 2. 5, 9. 2 Pet. 3. 11. Exod. 19. 6.
Deut. 7. 6. & 26. 19. & 28. 9. Isa. 62. 12. Rom. 12. 16.

§. 2. It is our *Separation to God as the Creator of our Nature, and our Redeemer, and the Author of Grace, and our Felicity, and the Cause of Glory: As the first Efficient, supreme Dirigent, and ultimately final Cause.*

§. 3. It is our *separation to God as our Owner by Resignation, as our Ruler by Obedience, and as our Benefactor and ultimate End by Thankfulness and Love, in the acknowledgment of his infinite power, wisdom and goodness, as essential to himself, and related to his works.*

§. 4. Holiness is our *dispositive, actual, and relative separation to God; 1. When our Souls are habitually inclined to God and to his Will. 2. When we actually give up our selves to God and to his will; by Consent first, and Obedience and Love after. 3. It signifieth the relation of the Person as thus habi-*

habitually and actually separated. (A holy Priesthood, 1 Pet. 2. 5, 9, 11.)

§. 5. *Holiness* is the Habit and Act of all the three Faculties of the rational Soul ; viz. 1. Of the *vital Active Power* by *Quickening and Strength*. 2. Of the *Intellect* by *Illumination*. 3. Of the *Will* by *Conversion, Love or Complacency*.

§. 6. The Soul as *sensitive*, and the *body it self*, are said to be sanctified, so far as they are dispositively and actually subject and subservient to a *holy Soul in Holiness*, and related accordingly as separate to God.

§. 7. Our *Holiness* is no alienation from the Creature as a Creature, in its due place and subordination to the Creator, but contrarily containeth our Honour of, and Love to, all God's Creatures for his *sake and impress*, and a devoting of all that is ours to his use : But it containeth a renunciation of that which is against his Honour and Government and Love, as such.

§. 8. As God communiceth *Holiness really* and *relatively* to Man, so *holy persons* communicate such *Holiness* to *Creatures* below them, as consisteth in the use and relation of things *separated to God*, by a *due separation* of them by their *dedication* and *holy use* : and that in various degrees.

§. 9. True *Holiness* is the Health, the Rectitude, the Honesty, the Justice of man's Soul ; and therefore necessary, as his *Duty* by God's Law, even of

Heb. 12. 14. Col. 1.
22. Eph. 1. 4. & 5.
27. 1 Pet. 1. 16.

of Nature, and to his Happiness both in the very nature of the thing, and by the determination of God's Law. It is a contradiction to be *happy* and *unholy*, Rev. 20:6.

§. 10. *Holiness* is the end or perfection of our Nature, and God's chief Interest in man, and is begun by Grace and perfected in Glory. Eph. 5: 27. & 4: 16, &c.

§. 11. The *Fear* of God and his Judgments, and a *Care* of our own Souls, and a *Sorrow* for Sin, and a desire of *Happiness*, may be not only Preparatives, but lower parts of *Holiness*; but the true formal specifying nature of it consisteth in a love of God's infinite goodness, and a Will addicted to obey his Will, or a Pleas'dness in pleasing Him*: This is Holiness.

* Col. 1: 10.

1 Thess. 2: 4.

1 John 3: 22. Heb. 13: 21. Col. 3: 20. Heb. 11: 5.

§. 12. Because a man is denominated according to the predominant bent of his Will (or Soul) he is not to be called *Holy* who hath some slight inclination to please God, and more to please his own carnal Appetite and Will; or greater love to the Creature than to God.

§. 13. Christ himself came into the World to recover sinful Man by Holiness to God, and disdained not to be a means of Man's Sanctification, and to make this the notable operation of his Holy Spirit on us.

† Luk. 1: 75.

Eph. 4: 24.

1 Thess. 4: 7.

Heb. 12: 10.

Rom. 8: 1, 9.

§. 14. Whatsoever Law Men are under, before Christ or since, Jew or Gentile, Works or Grace, no man can be saved and happy without Holiness; that is, unless they be devoted in Obedience

dience and Love to GOD and Goodness.

§. 15. No man can be damned that is *holy*, while such; nor can God hate and make miserable those that truly love him and his governing Will.

§. 16. Yet a person that is *holy* may deserve *Damnation*, by deserving to be denied that help of the *Holy Spirit* by which his Holiness must be continued. And as to be *saved* is to be perfectly *sanctified*, so to *deserve Hell*, is to *deserve to be forsaken*, to the total loss of *Holiness*. And so though it be hard for us to know whether *Adam's* first loss of Innocency was a total loss of *Holiness*, yet if it were not, it was a forfeiture of *divine help*, and so a *mediate* loss of it. And so a man that loveth God sincerely, may by great Sin *deserve* to be deprived of the Spirit, and therefore we must pray for the pardon of such desert for the sake of Christ, though we cannot be damned or miserable while *holy*.

§. 17. Obj. But how doth God love a *holy Soul* if he forsake him, and withhold his Spirit? And if he be not loved of God, he is miserable? If he be loved, he will not be forsaken.

Ans. Answer this your self as to the Case of the Angels and *Adam*. God loved them, and yet not so as to secure them from the loss of Grace. But he so far loved them efficiently, as to give them that grace by which they could persevere; but not that by which they necessarily should persevere; and he loved them complacentially, according to the goodness which was in them, and yet they lost it.

§. 18. Obj. That is because they were left to their Free will, and had but sufficient Grace, and
not

not efficacious determining Grace : But it is now otherwise with all true Believers.

Ans. True Believers have not determining efficacious Grace, to prevent all sin, nor all such sin as Noah, Lot, David, Peter did commit : And that sin deserveth an answerable desertion of God, it being a deserting him first so far : And though God pardon it, yet the desert is presupposed to the pardon ; for it is desert of punishment that is pardoned.

§. 19. *Quest.* If a man were holy, (that is, an obedient Lover of God and Goodness) without Faith in Christ, would that save him ?

Ans. 1. The Covenant of Grace requireth various degrees of Faith, according to its several editions and promulgations : It is not the same degree of Faith, as to the Objects extensively, which was required of Jewish Believers before Christ's Incarnation, as is now of us, nor the same degree that was required of all the rest of the World as of the Jews. 2. But such a Faith in God our Redeemer as that Law which men are under maketh necessary to Salvation, is necessary to Holiness : And to ask what God will do with a man that is holy without Faith, is to talk of a non-existent Subject : There is no such man ; for without Faith it is impossible to please God : for he that cometh to God must believe that God is, and that he is the Rewarder of them that diligently seek him, notwithstanding original and actual Sin, and the Law of Innocency condemning us ; and therefore that he is under a pardoning and rewarding Law of Grace, Heb. 11. 6. No man can be sanctified without the Merit, Doctrine and Spirit of Christ, nor without that degree of Faith which
the

the Covenant which he is under requireth.

§. 20. *Quest.* What if a man that was sanctified by believing, should retain his Holiness, or Love and Obedience, and lose his Faith in Christ?

Ans. It is a thing that never was nor will be; and not to be disputed of.

§. 21. *Moral Virtue* in the proper sence of the word, is the same thing as *Holiness* taken comprehensively, as containing our *Love* and *Duty* to God, and to man for God's sake: But as *Holiness* is taken narrowly for our *Love* and *Duty* to God, as distinct from our *Love* and *Duty* to Man, so *Moral Virtue* is the *genus*, and *Holiness* the chief *species* of it. And thus we take *Moral Virtue* and *Moral Action*, and so all *Morality*, as contradistinct from *Physicks* or things meerly natural, not falling under the *genus moris*: And so *Virtue* and *Vice* (or *Sin*) are all that is *Moral*, that is, *Moral Good* and *Moral Evil*: And this is the first and most notable sence of the word.

But some of late have used *Moral* as contradistinct from *Holiness* or *Grace*, or from infused *Habits*, or from *Faith* and *Christianity*; and some tell us confidently but falsely, That this is the most fit and famous sence, and the word so to be taken when not otherwise explained. It's the sad case of Mankind, that we have no words but what are liable to ambiguity: And it's the unhappiness of the Church that hath so many Teachers that will dispute, write, and wrangle about words unexplained, and in the end shew, that under divers terms they mean the same matter in which they are agreed and know not their Agreement.

§. 22. As *Holiness* is sometimes taken so largely, as to comprehend all that God commandeth, and sometimes for the natural part of our Duty (Love and Obedience) as distinct from Faith in *Christ*, which is the mediate Grace, and of supernatural revelation ; so is *Morality* or *moral Virtue* distinguished.

§. 23. They that take *moral Virtue* so narrowly and improperly, as to mean no other *moral Virtue* than *Heathens* had, or than is taught in *Aristotle's* *Ethicks*, should first tell us,

Phil. 4. 8.

2 Pet. 1. 3, 5.

Pro. 12. 4. 31.

& 31. 29.

That this is their sence ; and then they may boldly declaim against those Preachers that take this for sufficient ; or that preach no other : For Scripture and Christianity were to little purpose if they taught us no more than the Writings of Philosophers do.

§. 24. And no doubt but it is a pitiful sign and an odious Crime in a Minister of Christ, to say little to the People of the Mysteries of Man's Redemption, the Person, and Offices, and Works of Christ, the Covenant of Grace, and the special Blessings given by it, our Union with Christ, Justification, Adoption, and the special Works of the Spirit on Mens Souls, and all the Duties and Pleasures of a Heavenly Conversation, in the love of the Father, the Grace of the Son, and the Communion of the Holy Spirit, and all this under pretence of magnifying and preaching up the Love of our Brethren, and Charity to the Poor, and Justice, and Temperance ; as if *Man* were our God, and to wrong man were the only Sin, and to wrong God were none, or God could be no otherwaies wronged.

P

§. 25. But

§. 25. But *Covetousness* and *Pride* contradicteth their own Doctrine: For among their good works those of *Piety* are first extolled; and those are the *enriching* of the Church, and that is *themselves*; and why them more than the poorer People about us? Because they are *sacred persons*, and *belong to God*, and *serve at his Altars*? Very good. And is *Piety* to a *sacred person* (and such as *they*) so great a Duty, and yet our *Piety* as *immediately to God himself*, an *indifferent thing*, in comparison of our Duty to *Man*? Yea, some usually make that part of *their Piety* which consisteth in the observance of their own *Traditions* and *unnecessary Injunctions*, to seem of great weight, while the holy observance of *God's own Laws* is perhaps accused as too much *preciseness* or *hypocrisie*; when indeed the Hypocrite is he, that instead of the life and serious practice of true Christian-Holiness, sets up and resteth in the *Image of Holiness*, and certain *formalities*, that are lifeless, to deceive himself and others.

§. 26. Where there is no *Faith* and *Love to God*, nor Duty done in *obedience to God*, there is no true *moral Virtue*, but somewhat *equivocally* so called, whatever good such may do to the Common wealth or to their Neighbors; for it wanteth the *principle*, *end* and *object* that should inform it.

§. 27. An *Hypocrite* may be said to have *moral Virtue*, as he may be said to have *Holiness*, that is, only *secundum quid*, yea, but *analogically*; yea, but *equivocally*, in that he hath no other sort of *Faith* and *Love* and *Obedience*.

§. 28. An *Infidel's moral Virtue*, and all unsanctified Heathens or other persons, is of the same sort only with this described of the Hypocrite:
And

And they err not that say, They have no true *moral Virtue*, but *analogical*.

§. 29. Yet *Nature* and *common Grace* do give men that which is *truly good* (and not only *minus malum*) and may do much good to others, and some to themselves, and is truly laudable and amiable, considered without the mixture simply in it self: But because the contrary evil is still the predominant part in all the un sanctified, it will not properly denominate them *good men*, nor the whole *action* a *good action*, save equivocally, analogically or *secundum quid*; because the form denominateth, which is here wanting.

§. 30. But if any one think otherwise, that the name of *moral Virtue*, yea, or *Holiness*, is due to the best actions or habits of *Heathens*, *Hypocrites*, or any un sanctified men, it is but a Controversie *de nomine*, and no otherwise to be regarded, while we agree of the things signified by that name.

§. 31. It is certain, that now there is no *moral good*, in any man on Earth, that is not the effect of some *Grace of God*, common or special; for even *Nature* now as reprieved, and maintained is an effect of *common Grace*; much more further gifts: But it is perverseness in some School-men, who make *common Grace* and *Special* (at least as to *Faith*) to be differenced only in the *Causation*, one being not infused and the other infused, but the same in act, and so that no man can know whether he have infused or acquired *Faith* (which some call but a *Moral Virtue*.)

C H A P. XVIII.

Of the necessity of Faith in Christ, where the Gospel is made known.

§. 1. **I**Nfidels take scandal from Christ's making *Faith in himself* to be so necessary to our Salvation, as if it tended only to his Honour, and were in its own Nature of no necessity to our happiness, but arbitrarily made so.

§. 2. And their reason also against this necessity, is, because *believing* is an act of the *Intellect*; and *Intellection* is not *free*, and in its self is no moral Act. A man cannot know or *believe* what he *would*, no, though he most earnestly desired it: And will God condemn men for that which they *fain* would do, and cannot? Especially when mens intellectual Capacities do so greatly differ, that some seem to differ but little from the Brutes.

§. 3. This Scandal ariseth from their not well understanding the *Nature* and *Reasons* of our *Faith in Christ*. 1. They falsely suppose it to be only an Act of the *Intellect* (where many Divines have given them the Scandal.) 2. They falsely suppose, That the *Intellect* herein is *necessitated* to unbelief. 3. And they consider not the *Ends* and *Uses* of our *Faith*.

§. 4. 1. The true nature of our *Faith*, is our *Trusting in Christ*, as our *Saviour*, who hath reconciled us to God, by his *Sacrifice* and *Merit*, that he may bring us to God, by *Justification*, *Adoption*, *Sanctification*, and *Glory*. It containeth *Assent*, *Consent*, and

and *Affiance*, though through penury of Words, we are fain to call it by some one of these names oft-times, as the occasion requireth: But indeed the very sence of *πίστις*, *fides*, and *Trust*, includeth all. And when the Act of the Intellect only is named, it is as including, or informing both the other.

§. 5. 2. Though the Intellect be not free of it self, it is free by participation, being *quoad exercitum*, under the Empire of the *Will* that is free. And the Will by commanding it to *act*, *search*, *think*, of the Evidences of Verity, may do so much towards the specifying of the Act, as that the meer *weakness* of *Understanding* without the fault of a *vicious Will*, shall keep no man in damnable Unbelief.

§. 6. For Christ hath many ways provided against meer *Weakness* of our *Understanding*: 1. By the *fewness* and *plainness* of necessary Articles of Faith: 2. By the fulness of *Evidence* of *Credibility*: 3. By *great Means* and *Helps* for our Faith, which he appointeth: 4. And by the powerful *Helps* of his *Spirit*, which is ready to illuminate us by these means.

§. 7. No man was ever yet known, that could say [*I have done my best to have obtained Faith, and did not obtain it.*] Though many can say, *I earnestly desired to believe, and could not*: Because those may desire it, that yet use not the means aright and faithfully, and that indulge their own *Prejudices*, or carnal Lusts, which hinder it.

§. 8. 3: In the saving of Sinners, there is considerable: 1. The great *Benefits* already given in the Purchase, *Merits* and *Covenant*: 2. The *greater Benefits* offered, and to be received hereafter:

3. The *Means* to be used on our part for obtaining them. 4. The *danger* and *loss*, if we miss of them. 5. The *ultimate End* of him that giveth them.

§. 9. And, 1. will not any reasonable Infidel confess, That *Thankfulness* is naturally due for great and inestimable Benefits? And how can a man be *thankful* for that which he *believeth* not was ever done for him, or given him? Or can he be *thankful* to he knoweth not *whom*?

§. 10. 2. Do not great Benefits freely offered, require *Acceptance*? And how can a man *accept* of that which he *believeth* not was ever purchased, procured, or offered him? Will you *accept* a *shadow*?

§. 11. 3. Christ never meant to carry Sluggards asleep to Heaven, but to save them in the *use of his appointed means*. 1. They must *learn* and *obey his Doctrine*; and can they *obey* it that *believe* it not? 2. They must take *Heaven* procured by a *Redeemer* for their *Hope* and *Portion*, and love, desire, and seek it above all: And who will do this, that *believeth* it not, and the Word that *promiseth* it? 3. They must take *Christ* for their *Guide*, and *Mediator*, and *Intercessor*, to bring them thither; and they must forsake all here that stands in competition, that they may obtain it: And can you do this, and not *believe* and *trust* him that must save you? Will you venture your life in the Hands of a Physician, and take his Medicines, if you *believe* not that he hath *Skill* and *Will* to cure you? Will you leave your Country; and follow one over Seas, that *promiseth* you a Kingdom, if you *trust* him not?

§. 12. 4. And who will avoid Sin, Temptations, and Hell, that believeth not him that tells them of the evil, and of the danger that is before him?

§. 13. 5. And God can have no lower *End* ultimately than *Himself*, and the Glory of our Redeemer is more excellent than *mine* or *yours*. And therefore if *We* have the *Salvation*, it is meet and necessary that *God* and our Redeemer have the *Love* and *Thanks*, the *Praise* and *Glory* of it.

§. 14. Yet hath not God arbitrarily made *Faith* more necessary than it is in the true *Reason* and *Aptitude* of it to its Ends. He hath not made to all a *Faith* so necessary of *Christ*, and his *Intercession*; and therefore though *Infants* and *Ideots* cannot actually believe, they may be saved by *Christ*: And though those before *Christ* believed not all that we must now believe, nor the *Gentiles* before, so much as the *Jews*, yet neither of them were thereby excluded from *Salvation*.

§. 15. Quest. Hath not *Christ* made the *Case* of *Christians* harder than it was before his *Incarnation*, to *Believers*, by making so many more *Articles* of our *Faith*, and those of necessity to our *Salvation*?

Ans. No, no more than it is our *Misery* to accept of more *Mercies* and *Benefits* than were offered to others. Our *Belief* is not of numerous unnecessary difficulties, but it is of such things as we must receive, and be *Partakers* of; it is the means of our *use* and *fruition*: Who would take it for a *Misery* to believe that the *King* will give him a *Lordship*, or that a *rich Man* will give him so much *Money*, if he will come and thankfully accept it? Every act of belief is but a means to some *Benefit* to be received.

§. 16. As Christ is the way to the *Father*, and the Mediator is to bring us unto God, so *Faith* in Christ is the *Mediate*, or healing Grace to help us to *Holiness*, or the Love of God, which being its End, is as much more noble than *Faith in Christ*: And *Faith* kindling Love to God, and Goodness, and Men; and Love kindled by *Faith*, is the Sum of the Christian Religion. And it is no *Disparagement* to Christ and *Faith* in him, to be taken for a *Means*; or to trust him, as one that will save to the uttermost all that come to God by him.

[CHAP. XIX.

Of the State of Infants as to Salvation.

§. 1. I Have said so much of this in two Books against the *Anabaptists*, and in my *Christian Directory*, that I shall therefore here be brief. What measure of Glory, and holy intellectual operations Infants shall have after Death, we know not; but we have reason to judge, that they shall not be like *Brutes*, nor so unintelligent as in the *Body*, nor sleep in an unactive Potentiality; but be intellectual Agents.

§. 2. The Conceits of a middle state of those unbaptized, as having *pœnam damni*, and not *pœnam sensus*, we know not what to make of, unless they suppose them to be not *actually*, but only *potentially* intelligent: For one that is deprived of *true felicity*, must by *knowing* it, have the sense of his Privation. Nor do we find in Scripture any Proof
of

of their middle State, however Reason may think it congruous.

§. 3. They that think all Infants saved, go on these different grounds: 1. Some think that they *have no sin*: But if *Pelagians* could prove that, it would be no Proof that they shall have *Heaven* or *Happiness*. 2. Others think that *Christ hath pardoned them* all that sin which was derived from *Adam*: But either they mean, that his *Sacrifice* and *Merit* immediately pardoned it; or that he hath pardoned them all by the Covenant, or Law of Grace. But, 1. Christ's Sacrifice and Merits are given to *God for Man*, and pardon no man immediately, but only *Merit* a *pardoning Covenant*. 2. And that Covenant doth indeed *in tantum*, pardon all men as far as *common Mercy* amounteth to (for the remitting any part of the punishment, is so far to remit the sin.) But the saving-pardon in question, it giveth to no man *actually* before the *Condition* be performed; for it is but a *conditional Pardon*: Therefore as no one at age, so no Infant hath any Pardon given him by that Covenant, that I can find, but only conditionally.

§. 4. All grant, That the Covenant pardoneth the Adult only *conditionally*; and if it should pardon *all Infants absolutely*, their Condition would be so much more happy than that of the Adult, as is not consistent with what Scripture, Reason, and Experience speaketh. And there is no such thing said of them in the Word of God, and therefore not to be believed.

§. 5. Those that think not *all Infants* (so dying) to be *saved and glorified*, are also of several minds. 1. Some think that *none are glorified*, as being incapable Subjects (whom I will not be-
stow

flow the labour to confute, nor to open the ill Consequents of it.) 2. Some think, that *some* are glorified, but *none* are positively punished with the *pœna sensus*. These seem to me less rational than the former : For either Infants will have actual Intelligence, and answerable Joys and Sorrows, or not : If not, the former, who reduce them all to meer *Potentiality*, or the state of Brutes, are in the right (of whom some will have them to be *Via-tor*es after Death in *vehiculo aereo*, and some are for their Transmigration, and return to Earth.) If yea, then as one part will have rational Joys, the other must have rational Sorrows, unless some *re-turn* to Earth, or some *middle state*, be better proved than I have yet seen.

§. 6. 3. Some think, that all that are *baptized*, are *saved*, and no other, (though the rest have no Pain.) But, 1. this is not suitable to the Nature of God, as a *Spirit*, and as most *wise* and *merciful*; nor yet to the Tenor of his Word, to lay *mens Salvation* and *Rejection* upon a meer outward Ceremony, or Act of Baptizing. The Seed of Believers may want it in many Cases of Impedition; and the Children of Cannibals and Infidels, might by Souldiers be taken away by thousands and baptized against the Parents Wills, and then turned to them again to be educated: And who can believe that barbarous Souldiers that must themselves be damned, can thus save thousands at their pleasures? There are many Infants that have no right to Baptism; and why then should it save them?

§. 7. 4. Some think, that all that are baptized by the *Parents Consent*, are saved: But what if a Heathen, or Infidel, or Atheist say, I believe *not* in

in God or Christ my self, but for worldly Ends, I desire my Child may be baptized (whether he say, I will, or I will not educate him unto Christianity.) There is no shew of Reason, much less of Scripture, that this should save the Children that are no better offered to God.

§. 8. 5. Some say, That all that any *Christian* (*Sinner* or *Hypocrite*) offereth to God, and is so baptized, shall be saved ; that is, That hath *Christian Godfather* or *Godmother*. But if so, then what if Christians take Heathens Children against their Wills, and baptize them, and then turn them home again ? Are they saved by the Ceremony, or by Consent to the Covenant ? Not by the meer Ceremony, as is, and shall be shewed : Not by Consent of any such Christian that hath no right to them, nor power to represent them ; else all the Children on Earth should be saved : For Christians would sit at home and consent for them, and dedicate them to God unseen : And sure God would not refuse to save them, because of distance, nor because unseen (for the Godfather may be blind) ; nor because unbaptized, when it cannot be had, and the Child hindereth it not.

§. 9. 6. Some say, That it is the *Churches Faith*, and dedicating them to God in Baptism that is the Condition of their Salvation : But this is not intelligible. If by the Church they mean all the Christian World, or all a National Church, or all a Diocesan Church, yea, or all a Parish-Church, they use not to be all *Godfathers*, nor to offer other folks Children to be baptized ; nor did I ever know one that had so common a Vote, or was so offered : If they mean that the *Churches Faith* serveth whoever be the Covenanter or Offerer, then
all

all the Pagan World may have their Children saved by the *Churches Faith*, or all that can be caught up and baptized (and so the Ceremony doth it.) But if they mean by that Church the *Bishops* or *Presbyters*, whether it must be *all the Bishops* of the *World*, or of the *Nation*, or *one Bishop*, or the *Presbyter that baptizeth*, every one may speak according to his own Invention and Fancy, but with no Proof from the Word of God or Reason (as the *aforesaid Disproofs* do manifest.)

§. 10. 7. Some say, That any one baptized by a *Godfather's offer*, who *undertaketh for his Christian Education*, shall be saved, and no other. But,
 1. The Godfather may have *no Propriety* in the Child, but steal him, shall that save him? 2. The Godfather may be an Hypocrite, and mean nothing that he promiseth; and shall the Child be saved by his Lye that damneth the Lyer himself?
 3. Why should a *Promise of future Education* save a Child that must *die to morrow*, or ere long?
 4. But if it be the *meer opus operatum* of *Baptizing* that must save, that may be a *Profanation* when *unduly applied*; and the Priest's sin that damneth himself, cannot save others.

§. 11. 8. Some lay the hope upon *Ancestors Faith*, and say, That if the Great Grandfathers, or others before them were faithful, the Infants shall be saved: But then are all Men saved for *Noah's Faith*? Or how far must our Confidence ascend?

§. 12. 9. Most of the *Anabaptists* with us, hold, That there is no Promise, nor Assurance of the saving of any particular Infants in the World, either Christians or Heathens; but only that God electeth *some*, whom he will sanctifie and save, and

re-

reprobate others, whom he will damn; without any notice given to the World who they be, or how many, or how few. So that we cannot say, that he will save Ten, or that he will damn Ten of all the World; nor have the Faithful any more promise than Heathens of the Salvation of their Infants, and so are not to baptize them.

§. 13. 10. The commonest Opinion among the *English Calvinists*, is, That God hath made no certain Promise of the Salvation of any *particular Infant*, but by his *general Promise of mercy to the Seed of the Faithful*, hath given us cause to hope that more of them than of others, shall be saved; and therefore that they are by Baptism to be entred into the *visible Church*, as we baptize the Adult, while we are not certain but they may be Hypocrites.

§. 14. But I think this would not warrant their *Baptism*, nor give us any certain hope of any ones Salvation. God hath but *one Covenant of Grace*, which giveth us *Christ and Life*; and God hath ordained *no Baptism*, but what is for the *Remission of Sin*, and *making us Members of Christ*, if we have the *Conditions* of Right to Baptism. The Adult professes *Faith and Repentance*; if they have them in sincerity, and consent with the Heart as well as the Tongue, they are certainly pardoned: If they are *Hypocrites*, and consent only with the Lips, they have notoriously the Qualification which the Church must require, and so are received to outward Communion, but not that which God requireth to *Remission and Salvation*. But if an *Infant* be the *Child of a true Believer*, he hath all that God and the Church require: And therefore if he
be

be to be baptized, he is certainly put into a state of Life, because no Condition is wanting on his part.

§. 15. 11. Others say, That the Children of *all Christians* (Sinners, or *Hypocrites*) if baptized, are in a state of *Pardon and Salvation*; and that God will not punish the Child for the Hypocrite or prophane Parents Sin. But by that rule *Heathens Children* should be in as safe a case, because God will not punish them for their Parents sin. Either *something* on the Parents part is a Condition of the Child's Right, or *nothing*. If *nothing*, Heathens and Christians Children are equal: If *something*, it must be true *Faith* (as to God's acceptance): For whatever the *Church* must do, (that knoweth not the Heart) it is incredible that God should have such a Covenant [Thy Child shall be saved if thou wilt, (though lyingly) offer him to me, tho' thou shalt be damned for that Lye.]

§. 16. 12. That which I acquiesce in is this: That God who visited *Adam's Sin* on all his Posterity,

See the full
proof in my
two Disput. of
Original Sin.

hath in the Covenant of Grace also so joined Infants to the Parents, that till they have a *Will* to chuse for themselves, their Parents may chuse for them, and dispose of them for their good, and God taketh them as Members of the Parents so far: And so he hath made many express *Promises* of mercy to the Faithful and their Seed, (and Threatnings to the Wicked and their Seed): And that this Mercy cannot be consistent with their Damnation; for it is to be their God, and to love and bless them, which cannot stand with damning them. And God having but *one Covenant*, seeing they are in the same Cove-

Covenant with their Parents, and not another, if it give *Pardon* to the *Parents*, it doth so also to the *Child*, of whom no Condition is required, but that he be offered by a believing Parent to God; whose Acceptance is Salvation.

§. 17. Therefore I think that the Synod of *Dort* truly conclude, *Act. 1. 17.* That *faithful Parents need not doubt of the Election and Salvation of their Children dying in infancy*: The Covenant certainly pardoneth and saveth them.

§. 18. But this is not only because they are *born* of their *Bodies*, nor yet is their *Faith* the *efficient Cause* of it; but there are two things go to qualify the *Receiver* as the *dispositive Condition*, that is, 1. That he be the *Child of a faithful Parent*, who *devoteth himself sincerely to God*. 2. And that he be *by the Parent devoted to God, by Consent*, that he be in the mutual Covenant: Which *virtually* all the *Faithful* do that have *Infants*, because they devote *themselves and theirs* to God to the utmost of their *Capacity*. And the *Recipient Subject* being thus qualified, *God's Covenant* pardoneth him, as the *efficient Instrument*, by signifying God's Will.

§. 19. Though the Promise here be not so plain, I deny not, that all true *Proprietors*, whose *own* the Child is, here be as *Parents*.

§. 20. God having not made the Case of Infants so plain to us as our *own*, that are *Adult*, there are difficult *Objections* against this way; but as it seems to me, much more against all the rest.

§. 21. The grand Objection is, That then some Infants lose a state of Salvation when they come to age. *Ans.* This will follow; but far harder things

things from all the rest: But, 1. This was thought no Absurdity for a Thousand years after the Apostles, when I cannot prove, that any one man thought that none of the *Adult* themselves fall away from true Sanctification and right to Life: When even *Augustine* the famous Defender of Election and Grace against *Pelagius*, thought that all the Elect only persevered, and that more were justified and sanctified than were Elect, and that the rest all fell away. 2. *Davenant* answereth this, That Infant-grace may be lost, and yet not the Grace of the Adult: Because it is but a *Relative Regeneration*, and an *Extrinseck Remission* of Sin, that giveth them Right to Impunity and Life, or if they are said to have the *Spirit*, it is not in a fixed Habit of Grace. If you say, They cannot be saved without real Holiness, I answer;

§. 22. 3. Distinguish of *Holiness*, and of the *Season* of it. 1. Infants have not actual Faith, nor necessarily a proper Habit, which is a *disposition* to facile acting *that same act*: But a *semen*, a Seed, (as *Amesius* rather calleth it than a *Habit* at first even in the Adult :) And *Calvin* saith, That some men, *semen fidei qualescunque perdunt*. Adam had such a Holiness as might be lost: And why may we not say, that Infants *first Grace* is of such a sort or degree? 2. And yet that none are saved without more; but that upon this first degree they have a right to Salvation, and that their further Holiness shall be given them whom God will, as part of their Salvation, to which they have right: At furthest, at death, in the same time and manner as perfect Holiness and Mortification of Sin is given to Believers that are till death im-

imperfect. A loseable degree of Holiness like Adam's, may be the way to more in all that so die.

§. 23. Divines use to mention three degrees of Grace in order to Faith it self. 1. So much Grace as maketh a man able to believe, (which they call Sufficient Grace.) 2. So much more as efficiently determineth him to the Act of Believing: This they call effectual Special Grace, and Protestants call it our Vocation effectual. 3. So much more as giveth him a fixed habit of Faith, Love, and all Holiness together. This Papists call Justification, and Protestants Sanctification. Vid. Amesii Medull. de voc. & sanct. Rolloc. de vocat. Bishop Downname against Pemble Append. to his Treatise of Perseverance, &c.

§. 24. Now some hold all these loseable: some hold only the last not loseable; and almost all hold the first loseable. Now, 1. What if we think that Infant's first Holiness, besides relative (*Pardon*, and *jus ad impunitatem & regnum*) is but of the first degree? Though a meer moral Power to believe be not enough to the Adult, because the Act is necessary to them, yet say Protestants, The Habit is not necessary to their first Covenant-Right, but is given by the Spirit in sanctification as a Covenant-Benefit. And why may not Infants be in a pardoned state, that at first have but that Grace which giveth a moral Power to believe when they come to age? Consider of the matter.

§. 25. I have so fully elsewhere proved, That Infants Church-membership

In two
Treatises
for Infants

Church-membership; and in my Review of Infant-Baptism.

was instituted both in the Covenant of Innocency, in the first edition of the *Covenant of Grace*; in the *Covenant of Peculiarity* with *Abraham*, and in the last edition of the *Covenant of Grace* by *Christ*; and also that God never had a Church on Earth, of which Infants were not Members, if the adult Members had Infants, that I will now supersede that Work.

CHAP. XX.

Of the Nature of Saving-Faith.

§. 1. **S**O much of this came in before on the by, as will excuse my brevity here. I have before shewed, That the Faith now in question is not meerly our *general Belief* and *Trust in God*, as a part of our Holiness, but the *mediate Belief* and *Trust in God* our Redeemer and our Saviour, which is made the Condition of the Covenant, & the means of our sanctification: And also that as the editions of the Covenant vary, and promulgation of it, so it is not the same degree or acts of Faith, as to the particular credenda or Articles to be believed, that was and is necessary to all persons in all times.

§. 2. Though the word [*Belief*] in *English*, and *Assent* in *Latin*, signifie strictly only the act of the *Understanding*, and *Saving Faith* is oft named from one act, yet really that Faith which in Scripture is made the Condition of Pardon and Salvation, doth essentially contain the Acts of every Faculty, even *Assent*, *Consent*, and *Affiance*; and

and *fides*; and *fides* do properly signifie *Trust*, even a consenting or voluntary *Trust* upon *believing*; as is afore said.

§. 3. We do very aptly call both the Act and Object by the same name *fides* in Latin, (and *Faith* in English, oft-times): For *Faith* is a *trusting* on another's *Faith*, *Fidelity* or *Trustiness*; and so the *fides asserentis seu promittentis*, & *fides credentis*, are related.

§. 4. The *Faith* that hath the promise of our Justification, is not to be called one only *Physical* act in *specie* (much less in *numero*): (That were but prophanely to jest with holy things); but it is a *moral* act or work of the *Soul*, containing many physical acts. Otherwise we should be all confounded, not knowing how to distinguish of all our physical acts of *Faith* *secundum speciem*, and then to know which of them is the right: And it would be but some very little of the true Objects of *Faith*, that justifying *Faith* must be constituted by: In a word, the Absurdities are so numerous that would follow, that I will not be so tedious as to name them.

§. 5. Saving *Faith* is such a moral work as we use to express by the names, *Believing*, *Trusting*, *Consenting*, *Taking*, *Accepting*, *Receiving*, in Contracts personal with men. If we say [*You shall Trust such a Physician, or take such a man for your Physician*] all men understand us, and none is so logically mad, as to think that by *Taking* or *Trusting* we mean only some one physical act of the smallest distribution. If we say [*I take this man for my King, my Master, my Commander or Captain, or this woman to be my Wife, &c.*] every one knoweth here what *Taking* meaneth: viz. our Consent to

that Relation, according to the nature and ends of it.

§. 6. Therefore though we use divers names for this Faith, and also on several occasions, give several half-descriptions of it, we mean still the same thing, and *suppose what we omit* to make the description entire.

§. 7. When we call *Faith* [*a Believing*] or [*Assent*] we mean *such an Assent* as prevaileth with the *Will*, to accept *Christ* with his *Grace* as offered in the Gospel, and consent to the Baptismal Covenant; and this indeed as a fruit of the *assenting act*, but as *essential* to *justifying Faith*.

§. 8. When we call it [*Consent*] or *Acceptance*, or [*Receiving Christ*] we mean, that as Man's Soul hath an Intellect and Will, and a true *actus humanus vel moralis*, is the act of both, but of the Intellect as directive, and of the Will as more perfective, or as the Faculty, primarily moral; so the same *Faith* which is initially in the *intellect's Assent*, is perfectlier in the *will's Consent*: And it is the *Receiving* of a *Saviour believed*, or the *Consent* to a believed Covenant: We *suppose Assent* when we name it *Consent*.

§. 9. And when we name it *Affiance* or *Trust*, we include both the former, and mean a resolved practical *Trust*, and *dedition of our selves accordingly* to one that covenanteth to bring us from Sin and Misery to GOD and Glory; where Belief and Consent to that Covenant are supposed.

§. 10. And the *Terminus a quo*, and the *renunciation of Competitors* and *Opposites*, is connoted, if not essentially included in *Saving Faith*: And there-

therefore Christ doth so often tell us, of *for-
saking all, if we will be his Disciples.*

§. 11. I use to express it by this similitude :
A Prince redeemeth a Slave, and also promiseth
him great Possessions and Honours in a Kingdom
in the *East Indies*, or at the *Antipodes*, if he will
leave his Servitude and his Country, and all that
he hath there, and go with him in his Ship, and
patiently endure the Sea-trials till he come thi-
ther. Here he must, 1. believe that the Prince
hath paid his rancome : 2. That he is a wise
man, and knoweth what he promised, and skilful
to conduct him safely through all the perils of the
Seas : 3. That he is an honest man, and intendeth
not to deceive him : 4. That he is sufficient or
able to perform his word : 5. And if upon this
belief he *trust him*, he will let go all and venture
in his Ship, and follow him. And here one tells
him that the Ship is unsound ; another tells him
that the Prince is a Deceiver, unable to perform
his Word, or unskilful, or dishonest, and some
way untrusty ; and another tells him that small
matters in his own Country, are better than grea-
ter with so much hazard ; and sets out the dangers
and terribleness of the Seas : Now if the man be
ask'd [*Do you believe, or will you trust me, or will
you not ?*] here every one by *believing* and *trusting*
knoweth, that a *practical Trust* is meant, which
lieth in such a *confidence* as *for-saketh all*, and *taketh*
the *promised Kingdom* for all his hope. Such is our
Saving Faith.

§. 12. As many Acts and many Objects go to
constitute Saving Faith, so if you will logically
anatomize it, all these following must be taken in.

§. 13. 1. The *principal Efficient Cause* is God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost respectively, according to their several operations.

§. 14. 2. The *Instrumental Cause* is the Word of God, and the Preaching and Preachers of it, or Parents, Friends, or some that reveal the Word unto us.

§. 15. 3. Subordinate auxiliary means are Providential Alterations, by some awaking Judgments, or inviting Mercies, or convincing Examples, &c.

§. 16. 4. The Soul of Man in all its three Faculties, *Vital-active, Intellective, and Volitive*, is, 1. the Recipient of the Divine Influx, and then, 2. the immediate *Efficient* or *Agent* of the Acts of Faith.

§. 17. 5. *Preparatory Grace and Duty* is ordinarily Man's *Disposition*, as he is the Recipient of God's Grace, and the *Agent* of believing. But God is free, and can work on the *unprepared*; but it is not to be taken for his ordinary way.

§. 18. 6. The *formal Object* of the assenting *Act* of Faith, is *veritas Dei revelantis*, the *Veracity* or *Truth* of God revealing his Will.

§. 19. 7. The *formal Object* of the accepting and receiving *Act*, is the Goodness of the *Benefits* offered us by the Covenant, as offered.

§. 20. 8. The *formal Object* of our *Trust* or *Affiance* is God's *fides, Fidelity*, because of his aforesaid *Veracity* in promising, and his Power, Wisdom and Benevolence as a Performer; and this full *Act* comprehendeth all the rest: It is God's *Trustiness*.

§. 21. 9. The *material Objects* of the assenting *Act* in genere, are all God's *Assertions* or *Revelations*:

tions : More especially the Gospel, or the *Christian Faith* objective ; according to the Edition of the Covenant which we are under.

§. 22. The *Essentials* of our objective *Christian Faith* constitute the *Essence* of our active *Saving Faith* ; and the *Integrals* of it constitute the *Integrity*.

§. 23. And it is of great importance to distinguish here (as to the Word and Objects) between
 1. the *signa* or words, 2. the *signification* or *sence*,
 3. the *things*, matter or *incomplex objects*, as distinct from words and *sence*, viz. *God, Christ, Grace, Heaven, Goodness, Justice, Men, &c.* And to hold, 1. That the words are not necessary for themselves, but for the *sence* ; and therefore *Translations*, or any words which give us the *same sence*, may serve to the being of *Saving Faith*. 2. That the *sence* it self is not necessary for it self ultimately, as if *Holiness* lay in notions, but for the things which that *sence* revealeth, viz. *God* to be loved and obeyed, *Christ* to be received, the *Holy Ghost* to be received and obeyed, *Holiness* and all *Grace* to be received, loved, used, encreased ; our *Brethren* to be loved, *Heaven* to be desired, &c. All *sence* will not bring us to the reception of the *things* ; for all is not apt ; but any that doth this (which must be *divine* and apt) will constitute us true Believers.

§. 24. 1. The *material Objects* of our acceptance and consent, are the Word of God commanding, offering, and promising, and the good of Duty and Benefit commanded, offered and promised ; that is, All that is given us in the baptismal Covenant, God the Father and his Love, the Son and his Grace,

and the Holy Ghost and his Communion: The Father as reconciled and adopting us, the Son as having redeemed us, to teach, rule, justify and save us; the Holy Spirit to sanctify, comfort, and perfect us.

§. 25. 11. The material Object of our Trust or Affiance is God himself, the prime Truth, Power and Good, and Christ as his Messenger and our Saviour, and the Holy Ghost as the Author of the Word, and the Word as being the Word of God: You must pardon us as necessitated to call God a material Object, analogically, for want of words.

§. 26. 12. The ultimate or final Objects of Saving Faith are, 1. God himself, the *ultimate ultimum*; that is, the perfect Complacency of his will in his Glory eternally shining forth in our Glory and the Glory of Christ with all the Church triumphant. 2. Next to that, This Glory it self (which is a created thing) and the Perfection of the Universe, and of Christ's Church and our selves, in which it consisteth. And therein our own Perfection, and our perfect sight, love and praise of our glorious God, and our Redeemer. 3. And next under that, the first fruits of all this in this World, in the foresaid love of the Father and Grace of the Son, and Communion of the Holy Spirit and the Church.

§. 27. If therefore we were put to give a full description of Saving Faith, we must be as large as this following, or such-like in sence, viz.

[" The Faith which the Adult must profess in
 " Baptism, as having the Promise of Justificati-
 " on and Salvation, is a sincere fiducial practical
 " Assent to Divine Revelations, and especially
 " to the Gospel, revealing and offering us God
 " him-

" himself to be our God and reconciled Father,
 " Christ to be our Saviour, viz. by his Incarna-
 " tion, meritorious Righteousness and Sacrifice,
 " Resurrection, Doctrine, Example, Government,
 " Intercession and final Judgment; and the Holy
 " Ghost to quicken, illuminate and sanctifie us,
 " that so we may live in the Love of the Father,
 " the Grace of the Son, and the Communion of
 " the Holy Spirit, and of the Christian Church,
 " being saved from our Enemies, Sin and Misery
 " initially in this Life, and perfectly in eternal
 " perfect Glory: With a fiducial acceptance of
 " the Gifts of the Covenant according to their
 " nature, and a sincere federal Consent; and
 " with a sincere devoting and giving up our
 " selves to God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost;
 " and renouncing of all that is inconsistent with
 " this Covenant: Which *Assent*, *Consent* and
 " *Trust* are the effects of the Gospel and Spirit of
 " Christ, and are founded on God's Fidelity,
 " that is, on the Veracity, Love and Sufficiency of
 " God Almighty, most wise and good, and on
 " Christ the Father's great Apostle, and on Christ's
 " sub-Apostles; and on the Gospel and especially
 " the Covenant of Grace, as on God's revealing and
 " donative Instrument; and on the manifold ob-
 " signant operations of the Holy Ghost (miracu-
 " lous and sanctifying) as God's infallible Atte-
 " station to the Gospel-Verity.]

§. 28. Historical Tradition of the Words,
 Books, and Matters of Fact, are subordinate neces-
 sary means of transmitting the Objects to our sense
 of Hearing, who live at such a distance from the
 Time, Place and Facts.

§. 29. But

§. 29. But though all these things aforesaid are in true Faith, yet a distinct Perception or Description of them all is not necessary in him that hath them. But a more general Conception of it, which will but consist with the true Reception of the *Things* signified by the Words (God, Christ, Grace &c.) may be certainly saving to a plain and simple-hearted Christian; when one that can describe it accurately, may be graceless: For it is *Believing*, and not *Defining Faith*, which God hath made necessary to Salvation.

§. 30. Therefore we do ordinarily well use shorter Descriptions to the People, and sometime we say, That *Faith in Christ, is our Christianity*; that is, our Assent and Consent to the Baptismal Covenant, and our Self-dedition to God therein. For in Scripture it is all one to be a *Believer*, a *Disciple of Christ*, and a *Christian*.

§. 31. Sometimes we say, That saving *Faith is a fiducial-practical Assent to the Truth of the Gospel, and Consent to the Covenant of Grace*; or an *Accepting of all the Benefits of the Covenant, as they are, and on the terms offered*; or an *Accepting of Christ and Life in, and with him there offered us*.

§. 32. Sometimes we say, *It is a practical Assent, or trusting on Christ as our only Saviour for Salvation, or to bring us to God and glory*: And in all these and the like we speak truly, and mean the same thing; some terms being used on occasion, while the rest are implied, and to be understood.

§. 33. Those that will needs call no act by the name of *Faith*, but *Assent*, and confine it to the *Intellect*, do yet seem to differ with us but *de nomine*, about a *Word*, and not the *Matter*: For they confess,

self, if there *concur* not a *Consent* of the Will, it is not *saving*, but as some call it *fides informis*; and so that *Assent* and *Consent* make up our necessary *Condition*, or means of our Union with Christ, or Interest in the Covenant-Rights or Gifts. And then seeing we are agreed so far of the matter, it's not worth much striving, whether one only, or both Acts shall be called *Faith*.

§. 34. When the first Reformers had to do with men that commended uncertainty of our Sincerity and Salvation, and kept People under a Spirit of Bondage, and tempted them (contrary to the Nature of Faith) to love this World better than the next, and to be afraid of dying, by being doubtful whether they should be saved; in the heat of opposition, some of them called *Faith*, *Assurance*, or certain or full Persuasion of our own personal Election, Pardon, and Salvation. But those that came after them, and those that conversed practically with Men of troubled Consciences, and observed the state of the greatest part of good Christians, followed not this Example, but spake more cautelously and soundly, and described Faith as I before have told you. For they found that not one of a multitude of godly Christians could say they were certain of their Election, Sincerity, or Salvation: And some that were forwardest to say so, were none of the best, and had not what they said they had.

§. 35. But whatever the transmarine Divines say, I can witness, that except ignorant *Antinomians*, or such Sectaries, rejected by the Orthodox, I remember not that I have met these forty years with one Divine that taketh saving-Faith to be such Assurance of our personal Election, Justification or Sal-

Salvation, especially the *first act*, which is not to believe that *we are justified*, but that *we may be justified*.

§. 36. Indeed you would think those few must hold this, who say, That Justification is an immanent eternal Act of God. But, 1. this is but a difference about the word [*Justification*]: All confess, that God's essential Volition of our Justification is eternal, as being himself; but some think that his *Will* may be denominated an *Eternal Justification*; and others better say, *Not*: But all confess that the Law of Grace doth justify no man till he believe, much less the Sentence of Christ as Judge. And though some call our Perswasion that we are justified, by the name of *Faith*, yet they deny not another act of Faith antecedent to this, that maketh us true Christians.

§. 37. And indeed, besides Mr. *Pemle* and Dr. *Twisse* (both excellent Men) it's rare to meet with any *English* Divine that talks for *Eternal Justification*: And Mr. *Pemle*, who let fall some such things in his *Vindicia Gratia*, did set all right again in his *Treatise of Justification* (being very young when he wrote even the last:) And Dr. *Twisse*, who in his *Vindic. Gratia*, hath some such words, speaketh elsewhere soundly, as Mr. *Jessop* his Scholar hath shewed in a *Treatise* purposely written to prove it, when I had taken exceptions against his words.

§. 38. It is therefore shameless Calumny of those who perswade their Followers, That the Reformed Churches take *Faith* for such an *Assurance* or Belief, that we are justified or elected, and shall be saved; only because they find some such word in some former disputing Doctors of ours;

ours ; when as all, or near all have so long renounced that Opinion, that he would be a Wonder among us in *England, Scotland, or Ireland* (and I think abroad) that should hold it.

§. 39. Yet we still say, That saving Faith is not only a believing that God's Word is true, but a believing it with personal Application to my self.

§. 40. But that Application is such as followeth. 1. I believe that Christ hath died for my sins as well as for the rest of the World. 2. I believe that the Gospel offereth Pardon and Salvation to me as well as to others. 3. I believe that God will have mercy on me, and Christ and Life shall be mine, if I shall truly believe and repent ; and Glory, if I persevere. 4. Hereupon I accept the Offer and Consent to the Covenant of Grace, which giveth me right to these Benefits, if I consent. 5. And so far as I can say that I am sincere in my repenting and believing, so far my *Faith* helpeth me to conclude that I am justified.

§. 41. But this last is a mixt act, and a rational Conclusion helped by Grace, whereof the *major* only is *de fide* [He that believeth is justified] but not the *Minor* [*I believe.*] Therefore we usually call it a *fruit of Faith*.

§. 42. Some incautelous Divines in the heat of Dispute do indeed say, That it is *de fide divina*, or a *Divine Word*, that [*I am a true Believer.*] And *Chamier* too unhappily goeth about to prove it by saying, That it is the *Word of the Spirit in us*, which is the [*Word of God :*] As if the Spirit spake in us *new Articles of Faith*, or a *new Word to be believed*, whose work in those that are not inspired Prophets, is but, 1. to cause us to believe that
Word

Word already given : 2. To be a *witnessing Evidence* that we are God's *Children*, by making us holy as he is holy, as similitude witnesseth a Child to be his Fathers. 3. And to help us to *discern* that *Holiness* or *Evidence*, and to exercise it, and to gather Comfort from such discerning it, and exercise.

§. 43. We now commonly disown all such Assertions ; I meet with no sober Divine that owneth them, because we grant, that *Conclusio semper sequitur partem debiliorem* : But yet we find that those few that call it *de fide*, do most of them mean no more, but that it's partly *de fide*, because the Major Proposition is so ; and so they differ but about a Logical Notion.

§. 44. Some have said indeed (beyond-Sea) That a man cannot believe, and not know it ; but we know thousands may believe, and yet doubt whether it be a sincere and saving sort of Faith.

But I have written so many Books of these matters, that I here add no more.

C H A P. XXI.

Of the nature of Righteousness, Justification, and Pardon.

§. I. **T**HE Controversies about Justification have made a great noise ; but I think that those *de re* are few, in comparison of those *de nomine*, even among all sorts of Christians ; and the confounding them by unskilful Heads, who have made the

the ignorant believe, that those which are but *de nomine*, are *de re*, hath kindled foolish Wrath, and quenched Christian Love, and taken up poor Souls with a deceitful Zeal, who have thought that they were contending for great and necessary Truths, when it was but for Logical Notions, Names, and Modes of Expression, over-commended to them by their several Teachers.

§. 2. The Words *Justice* (Righteousness) and *justification*, are very ambiguous used in many senses in the Scriptures, and in the Writings of Divines, and in the common use of men, which I have opened in so many Books, and so largely, as shall here excuse my brevity: The Sences which we are now most concerned to take notice of, are these following.

§. 3. *Righteousness* is considered *materially*, or *formally*: *Materially* it is, 1. immediately; 1. A *righteous Action*: 2. A *righteous Disposition* or *Habit*; 2. And thence a *righteous Person*.

§. 4. *Righteousness* *materially* is, 1. in some or other *particular Action*; 2. Or, in the *main bent of Heart and Life*: 3. Or, in *Perfection*. The first denominateth the Person *Righteous in hoc*, or *secundum quid*: The second denominateth him a sincerely Righteous Man: The third, a perfectly Righteous Man.

§. 5. In the notion of the *material Cause*, is included also the *Comparative* or *Relative State* and *Proportion of Actions*: When the Action is duly qualified and modified in its physical Nature and Circumstances, it is *materially just*.

§. 6. The *form* enquired of, is *Quid morale*? And it is the *Relation* of the Action, and Habit, and Person, as congruous to the *justitia mensurans*,
or

or the Rule of Righteousness. The Rule or Law first maketh *jus vel debitum*, and saith, This shall be your Duty, and your Neighbour's Due (and declareth God's Due :) And the *jus* being constituted by the Law (natural or positive) that which agreeth to it, is *justum*. So that Righteousness formally is a moral Relation resulting from the physical mode and relation of Actions and Habits, as compared with the Law or Rule. A moral Relation founded in a physical Congruity.

§. 7. Righteousness is both *materially* and *formally* distinguishable as towards God or Man: *Materially*, as it is God or Man that we deal *justly* or *injustly* by: *Formally*, as it is God himself, or Men ruling under him, who give us Laws, and make the *debitum vel jus*, or dispose of Propriety.

§. 8. Righteousness towards God being Relative to his Laws, is to be distinguished according to the several Laws that men are under, and according to the several parts of the Law, which give the word divers Sences.

§. 9. 1. Righteousness as related to the Precept as such, is nothing but Obedience, whether *partial*, *sincere*, or *perfect*: He that doth righteousness is *righteous*.

§. 10. 2. Righteousness related to a *meer Condition* (of Pardon or Salvation, &c.) is the performance of that Condition, which may be the *Causa judicanda*.

§. 11. 3. Righteousness, as related to the *premiant* or *donative* part of the Law or Promise, is our *jus ad premium*, our Right to that Reward or Gift.

§. 12. 4. Righteousness, as relative to the penal part, is our *jus ad impunitatem*, or when punishment is not due to us according to that Law.

§. 13. 1. Righteousness, as related to the Precept of the Law of Innocency, is *materially perfect, personal, continued Obedience* to our Creator.

§. 14. 2. Righteousness, as related to the Condition of that Law, is the *same*; because nothing but the said perfect Obedience is there made the Condition of Life.

§. 15. 3. Righteousness related to the rewarding part of that Law is right to that Life which is there promised; that is, to God's Love and Felicity.

§. 16. 4. Righteousness related to the Penalty of that Law, is a Right to Impunity, as to the Death which it threatneth to Sinners.

§. 17. 1. Righteousness, as related to the *meer preceptive* part of the Law of Grace, is also *perfect Obedience for the future* (not Innocency, as to the time past) for even Christ maketh *perfect Obedience* our Duty, though he pardon sin.

§. 18. 2. Righteousness, as related to the Condition of the Law of Grace, is *sincere Faith and Repentance*, as the Condition of our *first Right* to the present Gifts of the Covenant, and also *sincere Love and Obedience* to the end, as the Condition of our *final Justification and Glory*.

§. 19. 3. Righteousness, as related to the Reward of the Law of Grace, is our Right to our Relation to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and all the Gifts of the Covenant, Christ, Grace, and Glory.

§. 20. 4. Righteousness, as related to the penal part of the Law of Grace, is our Right to

R

Impu-

Impunity, as to the Punishment threatned specially by that Law.

§. 21. The meritorious Cause of both these last (our *Right to Impunity*, and *to Life*) is the *Righteousness* of Christ; for the sake of which the Condonation and Donations of the Covenant of Grace are given us.

§. 22. This Righteousness of Christ is his *fulfilling the Conditions* of his own proper Law or Covenant of Mediation: which is materially, 1. His habitual, 2. and actual Perfection in Resignation, Obedience and Love; 3. and therein his Humiliation and offering himself a Sacrifice for sin: 4. And all this exalted to acceptable Dignity by the Conjunction of the Divine Perfection.

§. 23. The Donative Covenant of Grace to Man being but a meer Instrument of Donation and Condonation, that which *procured it*, is the *procuring Cause of Pardon and Life*; that is, *Christ's meritorious Righteousness*.

§. 24. Though this Covenant pardon and justify no man till he perform the Condition, and be a capable Subject by that *moral Disposition*, yet when that Condition is performed, its performance maketh us but *meet Recipients*, and it is still the meritorious Righteousness of Christ, for which we have the free gift of Pardon and Life; for the performance of the Condition doth but remove the *receptive Incapacity* of the *Patient*, and the *suspension* of the Donation.

§. 25. *Justification* signifieth, 1. *making us righteous* and judicially justifiable. 2. *Judicial Justification* (1. By Plea, 2. By Evidence and Witness, 3. By Sentence.) 3. *Using us as Righteous by Execution*: Or, 1. *Constitutive*, 2. *Judicial*, and 3. *Executive Justification*.

§. 26.

§. 26. No man of common Understanding will deny the real difference of these three: And if the *Name* only be questioned, no man will reasonably deny, That in humane use the name is accordingly applicable to each: And that use of it is easily proved also in the Scripture; 1 Cor. 6. 11. Tit. 3. 7. Rev. 22. 11. &c. And the word *Righteous* and *Righteousness*, is so frequently used in Scripture for that called *Inherent*, or *Self-performed Righteousness* (incomparably offer than in any other Sence) as will help to inform us what *Constitutive Justification* is: And if any dislike the *Name*, let them call it [*Making us righteous*] if that will please them better than the word *justifying*.

§. 27. *Constitutive Justification* is ever first: God never judged a man righteous, that was not righteous.

§. 28. No man on earth is righteous by the *Condition*, or by the *rewarding Part* of the Law of *Innocency*. Not by the *Condition* as performed, for that *Condition* is perfect, perpetual, personal *Innocency*, which no man hath; nor is any righteous in conformity to the *Precept*, unless *secundum quid*, as a damnable Sinner's less *unrighteousness* may be called *Righteousness*: Nor is any one justified by the *Retributive* or *Promissory* part of that Law, because perfect *Innocency* is its *Condition*.

§. 29. Though that Law perfectly justify Christ, who perfectly fulfilled it, we are not therefore

Gen. 6. 9. Hof. 14.
9. Heb. 10. 38.
& 12. 23. Luke
1. 17. & 2. 25.
& 14. 14. & 15. 7.
Matth. 10. 41.
2 Pet. 2. 8. 1 Tim.
1. 9. Rom. 5. 7.
Mat. 13. 17. 1 Jo.
3. 7. 1 Pet. 3. 12.
& 4. 18. Heb. 11.
4. Mat. 13. 43.
& 25. 37. 46.
Rom. 10. 6, 10.
& 8. 4. 10. & 6.
13, 16, 19, 20. &
5. 17, 21. Rom. 2.
26. Act. 10. 35.
Luk. 1. 75. Mat.
5. 6, 20.

righteous in the sence of that Law, or justified by it, because Christ fulfilled it (of which more anon:) Because the sence of the Law was not [*Thou shalt obey, or another for thee.*] (It never mentioned a vicarious Obedience :) But [*thou thy self shalt perfectly obey.*]

§. 30. We are justified from, or against the curse of that first Law, by deliverance or grace; but it is by a Redeemer, and not by that Law.

§. 31. The Causes of our whole Justification (whose parts were before-mentioned) are these:

1. The constitutive Causes (called *Material* and *Formal*) are before opened, being divers in their divers parts: In brief, our Righteousness now is [*our Interest in the meritorious Righteousness of Christ, and our own performing of the Conditions of that Interest, or of the New Covenant by his Grace, and thereupon our Right to Impunity and Life (or to Salvation from destructive Punishment, and to Glory.*)

2. The efficient Causes are, 1. Principal, God: 2. Mediatory and meritorious, Christ and his Righteousness: 3. Instrumental (as to our *jus ad impunitatem & gloriam*) the Condonative and Donative Covenant. 4. The material *Dispositio receptiva* of this Right, is our Faith and Repentance, or performance of the Covenant's Condition hereof. 5. The principal Cause of this Faith or Disposition, is the Holy Ghost. 6. The instrumental, is the Word. 7. The mediate Agent is Man.

§. 32. That Justification which consisteth in our *jus impunitatis quoad poenam damni & sensus*, our right to impunity (as to Loss and Sense) is the same thing with Pardon of sin, whether you take both actively or passively.

§. 33. Obj. *If the Law of Innocency as a Covenant ceased upon Adam's Fall, no man but he and Eve was ever under it : And if so, they deserved not Damnation for any Sin but final Unbelief and Impenitency ; according to the Law of Grace : And if so, no such desert is forgiven them by Christ.*

§. 34. Ans. The Law of Grace taketh in the Law of Nature (*natura lapsa*), though not on the Terms of the first Covenant, as it was *natura integra*, for preservation of Innocency : And still all that God commandeth is our Duty, and all that he forbiddeth, is Sin ; and every sin deserveth death in the nature of it (for it cannot be Sin and not deserve Punishment) : but the difference is, That under the Law of Innocency it was *Desert unremedied* ; but now it is *Desert with present Remedy*, or an affixed Pardon to every penitent Believer. So much of the Law of Nature remaineth as maketh Punishment due *in primo instanti natura*, conjunct with a Pardon which maketh Impunity due *in secundo instanti* : As if the King should grant a future Pardon by a Law to every man that will list himself in his Wars under his Son, lest *in primo instanti*, their faults deserve punishment, while they are daily pardoned.

§. 35. II. Publick judicial Justification (for private I pass by) is *virtually* in the Law, or constitutive Justification before described : For when a man is righteous, the Law justifieth him *virtually* : And this is the sence that we are said to be justified by Faith in, primarily in Scripture : A Believer is made just indeed, and so is justifiable in Judgment, that is, justified *virtually* by the Law : As we use to say, *The Law doth justifie such a man.*)

§. 36. 1. But *actual judicial Justification* is principally by *our Judge* and subordinately by *Christ* as *our Advocate*, by *Plea*; and by *Evidence* and *Witness*; which is chiefly by the *Righteousness* of the *Cause* laid open to all the World.

§. 37. It is by the Law of Grace (the edition which men lived under) that Christ will judge the World: Therefore we must accordingly judge of his Justification.

§. 38. Seeing the thing to be judged of is the *meritum causa*, the *Merits of a man's Cause*; therefore the same may be the *meritorious Cause* and the *material* of this judicial Justification; and they err that take this for an Absurdity.

§. 39. Though the *great end* of God's Judgment of Man will be to glorifie his *own Justice, Mercy and Wisdom*, and to glorifie *Christ's Righteousness*, yet the *Cause of the day*, which is to be decided, is not *whether Christ be righteous*, but *We*: Nor whether he fulfilled his mediatorial Law; which is presupposed.

§. 40. Justification being related to (real or possible) *Accusation*, so many things as the *Accusation* may extend to, the Justification must extend to if perfect.

§. 41. But no man is perfectly and absolutely *just* or *justifiable*: For instance, 1. If we be accused to *have sinned*, we cannot be justified directly against this *Accusation*, but must plead guilty by *Confession*. For *factum non potest fieri infectum*, and that *Fact* will for ever be culpable: [*Adam did sin*] will for ever be a true assertion. The *Guilt of fact* or *fault* is never done away in it self; [that it was really a fault] and [that we really

ly did it,] will be an everlasting Truth: Of which more afterward.

§. 41. 2. If the Accusation be, That [*in Adam we deserved Death,*] it must be confessed: Yea, temporal Death and correcting Punishments are not only deserved but inflicted, and *not pardoned*, nor we justifiable herein.

§. 42. 3. If the Accusation be, that we *deserved to have Abatements of Grace, With-holdings of the Spirit,* and abatement of what Glory we might else have had, all this must be confessed.

§. 43. 4. Yea, if it be said, That our Sin *primo instanti* deserved Hell, it must be confessed, and against all this there is no direct Justification.

§. 44. But against these Accusations we must be justified: 1. If it be said, that we are of *Right to be damned*, or *have no Right to Heaven* but to Hell, this must be denied: And we must be justified by these several Causes: 1. Because *God's Justice* and the *Ends of the violated Law* are satisfied by Christ, and by his *Righteousness*, a free Gift of Pardon and Life are merited for us: 2. And this free *donation* is the Law that we are to be judged by, which giveth us Christ to be our Head, and Pardon and Life with him.

§. 45. 2. If it be said, That we are *Unbelievers, impenitent or unholy*, and did not fulfill the Conditions of the Covenant of Grace, we must deny it, and be justified against this by our *Faith, Repentance* and *Holiness* it self; or else we must be condemned and perish; for nothing else will do it.

§. 46. And seeing it will be the work of the day, to judge men as performers or non-performers of the said Conditions of the Law of Grace,

therefore it is that the Scripture speaketh so much of inherent or performed *Righteousness*, and of Christ's judging men according to their works, that is, their works which are the performance of that Condition.

§. 47. To be judged according to our Works, is to be justified or condemned according to our Works: For to be judged is the *genus*, and to be justified or condemned are the *species*. Judging is justifying or condemning.

§. 48. While all are agreed, that all men shall be justified or condemned according to their Works, it is unreasonable to quarrel at that height that many do, about the syllable [BY] (whether men be justified and condemned by their works) as if [according to them] and [by them] had a different sence; when as to judicial justification the sence is the very same, though as to the making of men just, the sence may differ.

§. 49. We are commonly agreed, that no man is justified by Works in any of these following sences.

1. No man is justified either *constitutively* or *judicially* by his Works done according to the *Law of Innocency*, that is, by perfect *personal Obedience* and *Love*, (because we have it not.)

2. No man is justified *constitutively* or *judicially*, by his Works done according to the *Mosaic Jewish Law* as such.

3. Much less by any Works of his own or other mens invention, which he accounteth good and are not so.

4. No man is justified by any Works set in opposition to or competition or co-ordination with Christ, but only in *subordination* to him and his
Righ-

Righteousness by which we are redeemed, and for which we are all first conditionally pardoned and justified by the Law of Grace.

5. No man could be justified by his Gospel-Obedience, or his Faith, if he were to be judged by the Law of Innocency, as not redeemed.

6. No man's Faith or Obedience will justify him in Judgment against this accusation, [*Thou art a Sinner*] or this [*Thy sin deserved Death.*] Nor as one that hath fulfilled all the *preceptive part* of the Law of Christ.

7. No Works do justify us, as meriting Life of God in proper commutative Justice.

8. No man is justified by *Tasks of working*, as contradistinct from believing and trusting on Free Grace: or by external works, without Christ's Spirit and spiritual Evangelical Duties.

9. No good Work or Act of Man was a Condition of God's giving us a Redeemer, or giving us a conditional justifying Law of Grace.

10. Man's true Faith and Repentance is not before the Grace which worketh it, and therefore is no Condition of that Grace.

11. Man's antecedent common Works, while he is impenitent, merit not properly the special Grace which causeth Faith and Repentance.

12. We have no Works that are acceptable to God, but what are the fruits of his Spirit and Grace.

§. 50. And on the other side we are agreed,

1. That we are justified by the *Works of Christ*, as the Meritorious Cause of our Justification.

2. That the Justification purchased and given us by Christ, is given us by a Law or Covenant of Grace, which giveth (as God's Instrument) Right
to

to *Impunity* and to *Life* to all true *penitent Believers*: And therefore he that is justified according to this Law of Grace, from the charge of *Impenitence* and *Unbelief*, must be justified by his *Repentance* and *Faith* materially, as being the Righteousness in question, as is aforesaid.

3. That *without Holiness none shall see God*: And if any be accused as unholy (and on that account no Member of Christ or Child of God, or Heir of Heaven) his *Holiness* must be the matter of his Justification.

4. That though our Faith, Repentance and Holiness be no *universal* absolute Righteousness, yet they are that on which the judiciary Scrutiny must pass, and which will be the question of the great day, on which our Life or Death will depend as on the *Condition* or *moral Qualification* of the *Receiver*.

5. That in this sence all men shall be judged, by Justification or Condemnation *according to their Works*, or what they have done; that is, as they have performed or not performed the Conditions of that Law of Grace which they were under (as aforesaid.)

6. That therefore they that will be justified at last, must *trust in Christ* that redeemed them, and be careful to perform the Conditions of his Law of Grace, and both must concurr.

7. That that which is the Righteousness which must justify us in Judgment, is the same that must now constitute us just.

8. That when our Right to Salvation is the thing in question to be judged, that which justifieth our Right to Salvation, justifieth the Person as to that Right; and so far the same thing is the Condition of

of our Right to Salvation and to our Justification.

9. And if any with *Augustine* will mean by [Justification] God's making us such as the Judge will justify by Sentence and Execution, then our Conversion is part of that Justification.

10. That Scripture sometimes taketh Justification in that sense, and most frequently by [Righteousness] meaneth that which consisteth in our Acts and Habits: In all this there is no place for Controversie or Disagreement.

§. 51. They that say, That we must have inherent and performed Righteousness, but that no man is at all justified by it, must take *justifying* in some particular limited sense, (which therefore they should explain by distinction) or else they speak gross contradiction: For it is no Righteousness if it constitute not the owner *righteous*, so far, or in that point; nor yet if the owner may not be justified by it in Judgment, against the accusation of being in that point or so far *unrighteous*. If he that doth Righteousness is righteous, that Righteousness will materially justify him against the false accusation of the contrary.

§. 52. Yea, while they make Faith, Repentance and Holiness but *Signs* and *Evidences* of our right to Life-eternal, they thereby allow it some place in Justification: For *Evidence* hath its place in Judgment: And they are *moral Evidences*, and not *physical* only.

§. 53. If men understood how atheological and perilous it is to conceit, that either *Faith* or any thing of ours, (no though we were innocent,) is any proper efficient Cause of God's own internal acts in our Justification, and would understand that
all

all can be no more than *dispositio receptiva*, which Dr. Twisse calls *causa dispositiva*, a meer receptive Aptitude, which is but the Qualification *causa materialis*, that is, of the Subject to be justified, it would presently lead them out of their vain Contention about Faith and Gospel-Obedience herein, and shew them how each in several respects and instances qualifie Man for the *beginning* or *continuance* of Justification, or for Right to Glory.

§. 54. It seemeth strange to some, to find the whole Old Testament, and all Christ's Sermons, and all the other Apostles, inculcating *inherent* and *performed* Righteousness, as that which Men must be judged about, to Life or Death, and yet to find Paul so oft pleading against Justification by Works. But if we will take the Scripture together, and not by incoherent scraps, the reconciliation is evident.

“ Man is now sinful, and condemned by the
 “ first Law, and is now under a Law of Grace,
 “ that freely giveth Pardon and Life through a
 “ Redeemer, to those that *believingly accept the*
 “ *Gift according to its nature, and consent by Re-*
 “ *pentance to turn to God, and live a holy life in*
 “ *sincerity* : Now God doth through all the Scri-
 “ pture tell us, That *no one shall pass with God for*
 “ *a just man, or be saved, that will not do this,*
 “ but shall be condemned further for refusing it :
 “ And thus he that doth Righteousness is righ-
 “ teous, and all shall be judged according to their
 “ works, thus required by the Law of Grace. To
 deny this, is to deny the scope of the whole Scri-
 pture, and the Government of God.

“ But Paul disputed against those that taught
 “ that the Gentiles must be profelyted, and keep
 “ the Law of Moses, or else they could not be
 “ accoun-

" accounted just men, nor be saved : And he pro-
 " veth, that the Gentiles being under the Law
 " of Grace, may pass with God for just men
 " and be saved, if they [*Believingly accept the*
 " *Gift of Grace according to its nature, and consent*
 " *by Repentance to turn to God, and live a holy life*
 " *in sincerity*] though they keep not the Jewish
 " Law : Yea, further, that though the Jewish
 " Fathers were obliged to keep that Law, it was
 " as it belonged to the Covenant of Grace and
 " of Faith, and that before that Law was given
 " *Abraham and others*, were just and saved by
 " Faith, according to the universal Law of
 " Grace ; and that the Task of Works, accor-
 " ding to the *Mosaic Law*, will of it self make
 " no man just or savable, and consequently no
 " other Task of Works, which would make the
 " Reward to be not of Grace but of Debt, and
 " is opposed to, or separated from Redemption
 " and the free condonation and donation of the
 " Covenant of Grace.] This is the plain drift
 of Paul.

§. 55. Works of Evangelical gratitude, love,
 and obedience, according to the Law of Grace,
 subordinate to, and supposing Redemption and the
 free gift of Pardon and Life to penitent believing
 Accepters, are those that Christ and James and all
 the Scripture make necessary to Salvation ; and
 our Consent and Covenant so to obey is necessary
 to our first or initial *Justification* ; and our *actual*
Obedience to the *Continuance and Confirmation* of it.
 But a Task of Works either, of *Moses's Law* or
 any other set against Redemption and free Grace,
 or not as aforesaid, duly subordinate to them, is
 disclaimed by Paul and all Christians, as that which
 can

can constitute no man just in God's account, nor such a one as hath right to Salvation.

§. 56. I verily think, that were their verbal and notional differences discussed, and men understood themselves and one another, it will prove, that this aforesaid is the true meaning of almost all Christians, and that they agree in this sense, while they mischievously contend about ill or unexplained words.

§. 57. What I have said of Justification, is mostly true of Pardon of Sin: Pardon is threefold, 1. Constitutive, which is God's giving us a *Right to Impunity*: This is God's act by the pardoning Covenant or Law of Grace. 2. By *Sentence*, judging us so pardoned. 3. *Executive*, taking off, or not inflicting Punishment deserved.

§. 58. God's *non punire*, and *nolle punire*, not punishing and his will not to punish, are true pardon when the Sinner, and *Sin* and *Guilt* are *pre-existent*: But they are no pardon before; because not capable of such a relation and denomination for want of a *real terminus*. Therefore God's eternal will to pardon, or his not punishing man from Eternity before Man was *Man*, or *sinful*, must have no such name; which *afterward it may have* without any change in God, but in man only.

§. 59. Some worthy men say, that Pardon is not Justification, nor to be pardoned is to be righteous; and that Righteousness is never taken in Scripture for Pardon, but many score or hundred times for our performance of our Duty according to the Law of Grace: Therefore they would have Righteousness and Pardon still distinguished.

§. 60. But I have plainly before proved, that Righteousness hath many parts, and the word many
sences,

sences, and though *Pardon* be not that Righteousness which consisteth in a Conformity to the Precept, (and so is not our *universal Righteousness*) yet Pardon is (passive) that *Righteousness* which consisteth in our *right to Impunity* both as to the punishment of *Loss* and *Sence*: And *Pardon* with *Adoption* or the Gift of Life, is that Righteousness which consisteth in our *right to Life* eternal.

§. 61. 1. All mens sins are pardoned *potentially* and *conditionally* in the Law of Grace. 2. No mens sins are pardoned *actually* (as to a *right of Impunity*) till they are penitent Believers, or consent to the Covenant of Grace (if at age.) 3. These penitent Believers sins are *pardoned virtually* before they are committed, supposing them but Sins of Infirmary, but this is properly no *Pardon*, nor so to be called, because it is but the position of those things which will cause Pardon hereafter. To be only *virtual*, is not to exist, but to be *in causis*.

But it is too grossly inferred hence by some, That it is not God then that actually justifieth, but Man that performeth the Condition; as if the Condition which is but a suspension of the Donation, (and the performance a removal of the suspending Cause) were the donative Efficient; and so the Receiver were the Giver. As if he that opened the window were the *Sun* or *efficient Cause of the Light*; or he that lets off a *Crossbow* by removing the *Stop*, were the *Spring* that effecteth the motion of the *Arrow*.

§. 62. Neither Pardon nor Justification are perfect before death: For there are some *correcting Punishments* to be yet born, some *Sins* not fully destroyed, some Grace yet wanting, more Sins to be forgiven, more Conditions thereof to be performed. The final and executive Pardon and Justification are only perfect.

CHAP.

C H A P. XXII.

Of the Imputation of Righteousness.

§. 1. **T**HE great Contentions that have been about this Point, tell us how needfull it is to distinguish between real and verbal Controversies : The opening of the Doctrine of Redemption before, *Chap. XI.* hath donemost that is needful to the solution of this Case, we are commonly agreed in these following Points.

§. 2. 1. That no man hath a Righteousness of his own performance, by which he could be justified, were he to be judged by the Law of Innocency ; that is, all are Sinners, and deserve everlasting Death.

§. 3. 2. That Jesus the Mediator undertook to fulfil all the Law which God the Father gave him, even the Law of Nature, the Law of *Moses*, and that which was proper to himself, that thereby God's Wisdom, Goodness, Truth, Justice, and Mercy, might be glorified, and the ends of God's Government be better attained, than by the Destruction of the sinful World ; and all this he performed in our *Nature*, and suffered for us in our *stead* ; and was the second *Adam*, or Root to Believers.

§. 4. 3. That for this, as the *meritorious Cause*, God hath given him power over all *Flesh*, that he might give eternal Life to as many as are drawn to him by the Father, and given him, *Joh. 17. 2.* He is Lord

Lord of all, and all power in Heaven and Earth is given him, Matth. 28. 19. and he is made Head over all things to the Church, Eph. 1. 22, 23. Rom. 14. 9. And for these his Merits, a Covenant, or Law of Grace is made to sinful Man, by which all his sins are freely pardoned, and Right to Impunity and Life is freely given him, if he will accept it, and penitently turn to God.

§. 5. 4. Whenever a man is pardoned and justified (or hath Right to Life) this Law of Grace doth it, as God's donative Instrument: And whoever is so pardoned and justified, it is for and by these Merits of Christ's Righteousness.

§. 6. 5. But Christ doth initially pardon and justify none by this Covenant but penitent Believers, and therefore hath made it our Duty to repent and believe, that we may be forgiven, and have right to life; as the Condition, without which his donative and condonative Act shall be suspended.

§. 7. 6. God never judgeth falsely, but knoweth all things to be what they are: And therefore he reputeth Christ's meritorious Righteousness and Sacrifice, to be the meritorious Cause of all mens Justification, who are justified (and of the conditional Pardon of all the World, 2 Cor. 5. 18, 19, 20.) and as sufficient and effectual to the assigned ends, as our own personal righteousness or suffering would have been, and more (though it be not so ours, as that of our own performance would have been, nor so immediately give us our Right to Impunity and Life, but mediately by the Covenant.)

§. 8. 7. And as God reputeth Christ's Righteousness to be the prime meritorious Cause for which we are justified by the Law of Grace, as afore-said,

so he truly reputeth our *own Faith* and *Repentance* (or *Covenant-consent*) to be our *moral Qualification* for the *gift*, and our *Holiness* and *Perseverance* to be our *moral Qualification* for *final Justification* and *Glory*; which *Qualification* being the *matter* of the *Command* of the *Law of Grace*, and the *Condition* of its *Promise*, is so far our *righteousness* indeed, and oft so called in the *Scripture*, as is afore-said.

§. 9. 8. Therefore God may in this Sence be truly said, both to *impute righteousness* to us, and to *impute Christ's righteousness* to us, and to *impute our Faith* for *righteousness* to us in several respects.

§. 10. Thus much being commonly agreed on, should quiet the Minds of Divines that are not *wise* and *righteous* overmuch; and it becometh us not to make our arbitrary Words and Notions about the Doctrine of our Peace with God, to be Engines to break the Church's Peace, seeing Angels preached to us this great Truth; That Christ came into the World for *GLORY* to God in the highest, and for *PEACE* on Earth, and for *GOOD-WILL* or *LOVE* from God to Man (or *mutual complacency*;) and his Servants should not turn his Gospel into matter of strife.

§. 11. That which we are yet disagreed about, is the Names and Notions following: As, 1. What is meant by the Phrase of [*Imputing*] in several Texts of Scripture; as *Rom. 4. 11.* [*That righteousness might be imputed* (or reckoned) *to them also.*] *Ans.* The words seem to me to have no difficulty; but what men by wrangling put into them. To have *righteousness imputed* to them, is to be reputed, judged, or accounted as righteous Men,

Men, and so used (the *cause* being not in the *Phrase* it self, but fore-described.)

§. 12. So what is meant *Rom. 4. 6.* by *imputing righteousness without works*? *Ans.* Plainly, *reputing*, or *judging* a man righteous without the works which *Paul* there meaneth.

§. 13. So what is meant by *Not imputing sin*, *Psal. 32. 2.* *2 Cor. 5. 19.* *Rom. 5. 13.* *Lev. 7. 18.* *1 Sam. 22. 15.* *2 Sam. 19. 19.* *Rom. 4. 8*? *Ans.* Not-judging a man as a Sinner guilty of punishment, not charging his sin upon him in Judgment; which is as *2 Sam. 19. 19.* &c. because he is not truly guilty; or as *Rom. 4. 8.* &c. because he is forgiven.

§. 14. 2. What is meant by [*imputing our Faith to us for righteousness*?] But of that more purposely anon.

§. 15. 3. Whether *imputing Christ's righteousness to us*, be a Scripture-phrase? *Ans.* Not that I can find.

§. 16. 4. Whether it be a fit or lawful Phrase, and whether in so great matters, departing from Scripture-phrase, and pretending it necessary so to do, be not adding to God's Word, or the cause of Corruptions and Divisions in the Church, and an intimation that we can speak better than the Holy Ghost? *Ans.* God hath not tied us to use only Scripture-words or Phrases; and use may make them convenient and needful for some times and places, which else are less significant or congruous. And in this case I see not, but that the Phrase is lawful well explained. But if any will pretend their own Phrases to be more necessary than they are, and will calumniate those as not Orthodox, who will not use them, or subscribe to them, I

cannot justify such from the guilt of Presumption, and Injury to the Church, the Truth and Christ, and the Love of Brethren.

§. 17. 5. Whether they that affirm, That Christ's Righteousness is imputed to us, or those that deny it are to be accounted Orthodox?

Ans. Perhaps both, if they both hold the same sound Doctrine under various Phrases: And perhaps neither, if by their various Phrases, each mean something that is unsound.

§. 18. They heinously err, who deny Christ's Righteousness to be so far imputed to us, as to be reputed the *meritorious Cause* of our Pardon and Right to Life (or our Justification) performed by our Mediator, as the *Sponsor of the New Covenant*, (for our *sakes*, and his Sufferings in *our stead*) as is afore-expressed.

§. 19. And they heinously err, and subvert the Gospel, who say, that Christ's Righteousness is so imputed to us, as that God reputeth, or judgeth Christ to have been *perfectly holy and righteous* (or obedient) and to have suffered, though not in the Natural, yet in the *Legal or Civil* Person of the *Sinner or Believer*, as their *strict and proper Representer*; and reputeth us to have been *perfectly holy, righteous, or obedient in Christ, as our Representer*, and so to have *our selves fulfilled all righteousness in and by him*, and in him to have satisfied Justice, and merited Eternal Life, and Christ's Righteousness to be ours in the same sense of Propriety, as it was his own: For his Divine Righteousness is the Essence of God, and his Humane his *Habits, Acts, and Relations*, which are the Accidents of his own Person only as the Subject, and cannot be in another (as is after shewed.)

§. 20. Though most of us now leave this Doctrine to the *Antinomians* or *Libertines*, yet so many Protestants formerly have seemed to own it by their unmeet Phrases, in extreme opposition to the Papists, or at least to come too near it, as hath greatly scandalized and hardened their Adversaries, and injured the Reformed Churches.

§. 21. The Person of our Mediator was neither in the Sence of the Law, or in God's account, properly the person of the Sinner; Christ and we are distinct persons.

§. 22. Had we been *perfectly holy, innocent, and obedient in Christ*, it would follow, 1. That we are justified by the Law of Innocency, as having perfectly done all that it commanded us, which is not true: It is by the pardoning Law of Grace that we are justified.

§. 23. 2. That we have no need of Pardon, nor of Christ's Sufferings for our Pardon, nor of Prayer for Pardon, nor any means for it; for he needeth no pardon that is perfectly innocent.

§. 24. 3. Therefore they assert Contradictions when they say, that we both perfectly obeyed by, and in Christ, and yet suffered or satisfied in, or by him for our Disobedience.

§. 25. 4. It would follow, that all penalties (even corrective) laid on us by God, are injuries, or no penalties, because we are innocent.

§. 26. 5. And that God's denying us any helps of his Spirit, and permitting the remnant of our Sin yet unhealed, and the weakness of our Graces, are an injurious denying us our Right.

§. 27. 6. It would follow, that we have present Right to the present possession of the whole Re-

ward, both Grace and Glory, and that our delay is our wrong; because he that is supposed to have done all that the Law maketh his Duty from his Birth till his Death, hath right to the Reward by the Law or Covenant.

§. 28. 7. And it would follow, That no Duty could be required of us as a Condition of any Benefit purchased by Christ, nor any sin charged on us so far as to be indeed our sin, because we are reputed perfectly holy and innocent.

§. 29. Many other such Consequents I pass by, and other Arguments against this Opinion, and the Confutation of the contrary, because I have done it all elsewhere, especially in a peculiar Discourse on this * Subject, and in my Disputations of Justification.

§. 30. Christ's own Righteousness habitual or actual, is not ours, as it is his, in strict sence in it self, as if we were the *Proprietors*, the Subjects of his Habits, or the Agents of his Acts: For it is impossible that the Accidents of several Subjects should be the same.

§. 31. And the *form* of Christ's Righteousness is therefore no more *ours*, than the *Matter*: For Righteousness in Christ, and Righteousness in each Believer, are distinct Righteousnesses.

§. 32. Many Divines have pleaded, That Christ's Righteousness is the *form* of ours; and others, that it is the *Matter*; and others, that it is the *meritorious Cause*; and have too much troubled the Church with Logical Notions. The meritorious Cause it is undoubtedly; and they that say, That it cannot then be the *material Cause*, must consider,

sider, that we mean, that it is the *Matter* of the *meritorious Cause*: And had we been *innocent* our selves, would not our *Innocency* have been both the *Matter* of our *righteousness* (or *Merit*) and the *meritorious Cause* of our *right to Life*.

§. 33. But this supposeth that the *Matter* of the Gospel subordinate righteousness which consisteth in that Repentance, Faith, and Holiness, which is required in us to our right to life, is to be found in our selves, and not in Christ for us.

§. 34. But the *form* of Christ's righteousness cannot be the form of ours, as is afore said; but it is the form of that which is the meritorious Cause of ours: But what need have we of these Disputes?

§. 35. The *Not imputing of sin*, is called also by some, the *Form of Justification*; and by others, *that*, and the *Imputation of righteousness* conjunct; and by others, *that*, and *God's accepting us as righteous*; others call these the *Matter of Justification*; and thus mens Logick, ill-managed, troubleth the Hearers, which I would not mention, had it not been necessary to disentangle them.

§. 36. They that will dispute what is the *form of Justification*, must first confess the Ambiguity of the Word, and tell us in which Sence they take it: There are so many things that are truly the *form of Justification* taken in many Sences, that without such distinguishing to dispute of the *form of Justification*, is worse than to say nothing: *Justification* taken actively, as the *Act of the Justifier*, hath one form: *Justification* passively taken for the state of the justified, hath another form: And each of these are subdivided into many *Acts*, and many *Effects*, which have each their *form*. The *Act of*

pardon-

pardoning sin, is one thing, and therefore hath one form: The Act of making us inherently righteous, or performers of the Condition of the Covenant of Grace hath another form: The Act of *esteeming* us righteous, hath another: The Act of our Advocate defending our righteousness, another. The Act of Justifying-evidence and Witness, another: The Act of sentencing us righteous, another: And the Act of executive Justification, or rewarding and saving us, as righteous, another. And accordingly. *Justification passively* taken, hath as many forms as it signifieth various Effects. To be in a state of conditional Justification, to be Performers of the Condition of the Law of Grace, to have *jus impunitatis*, right to Impunity (that is, to be pardoned) and to have *jus Doni & Præmii regni celestis*, a right to Glory, as a gift, and as a reward (in several respects) are all Effects of God's foresaid Acts, and every one hath its proper Being and Form: And all this as given us; for the Merits of Christ's righteousness, concur to make up *our whole Justification as constitutive and virtual in Law*; and each part hath its proper form: And then Apologetick, Judiciary (or Sentential) and Executive Justification, are also various Species, which have their Forms.

§. 36. Obj. *Unius rei unica est forma*: Justification is one thing, and therefore hath but one form. Ans. 1. *One Justification* is but one thing; but there are divers things so called, even in Scripture. When Christ saith, *By thy words thou shalt be justified*, Mat. 23. and Paul saith, that we are justified by the Spirit of God, 1 Cor. 6. 10. and John saith, *He that is just, let him be justified still*, Rev. 22. they have not all the same Sense. 2. *One thing* may have

have *one form*, and yet its *many parts* have *many forms*: Our *righteousness* taken for the *whole* of it, is *one whole*, whose form is signified by that general Name of our *total righteousness*; and yet its *parts* are all those before-mentioned, which yet each severally are commonly called *righteousness*. But of these things before.

§. 37. Either then let us meddle as little as may be, with arbitrary Logical Notions in Theology, or let us handle them exactly, or else unskilful using them in weighty matters, becomes a vain entangling of poor Souls, and a childish way of troubling the Church of God. The truth is, the *forms* of such *Acts* are best known by their bare *Names*, if they be *rightly named*; and by the *Name* many understand what they are, where neither *they* nor their *Teachers* can find other words by which to give you a fair Definition of them, which maketh me think of some of our *over-wise*, and *over-righteous* Catechizers of the ignorant, who use to turn plain, honest persons from the Sacrament of Communion, if they cannot tell them what *God is*, what *Holiness is*, what *Faith*, *Repentance*, *Sanctification*, *Justification*, *Adoption* is, by some congruous Description, when yet a wise Examination might shew, that by the *Name* they understand the Matter it self, though not by distinct Notions; and when the Catechizer too often would be found shamefully to seek, if he were put to answer his own Questions by a true Definition (as I have tried.)

§. 38. To conclude, there are many sharp Volumes written of late, which reproach *Imputed Right-*

Righteousness, to which they seem induced by some mens misexplication of it; and by such unwarrantable words as some Independents use of it, in their Savoy-Confession: And they dream that we deny all necessity of Personal fulfilling the Conditions of the Law of Grace, as a means of our Justification and Salvation: But they utterly wrong the generality of Divines of my acquaintance and notice: And I must tell them, for the Independents, that they did not subscribe or *vote* that Confession, as some present assure me, but only a very few men brought it in and read it, and none spake against it: And some worthy persons of that Assembly, upon conference, assure me, That how ill soever it be worded, they themselves did mean it as I and other Protestants do, and did disclaim the obvious ill sense.

And I add, Had these Contenders but taken up with the distinction of Imputation which Mr. *Bradshaw* giveth in the Preface to his *reconciling Treatise of justification*, it might have quieted them, by informing them, in what sense Christ's Righteousness is imputed to us, and in what not: And they would have seen that which is not ours, as *Proprietaries* of the thing it self in *se*, may be called *ours*, because the *Effects* are *ours*, and it was *given to God*, for the meriting of those Effects *for us*.

C H A P. XXIII.

How Faith justifieth ; and how it is imputed to us for Righteousness.

§. 1. **A**Bout this also there are many needless notional Controversies among men that are agreed in the matter it self : As whether *Faith* justifie as it receiveth *Christ* in all his mediatorial Office, as *Prophet, Priest and King* ? Or only as in his *Priestly Office* ? And whether, as it receiveth him in all the parts of that Office, or which ? Or as it receiveth his *Righteousness* only ? Whether *Faith* justifie us as an *Instrument* only ? Or as a *Condition* ? Or as *meritorious* ? Whether it justifie us by being it self imputed to us for *Righteousness*, or it be *Christ's righteousness* only that is so imputed ? Whether *Faith* alone justifies us, or also *Repentance, Desire, Hope*, or any other acts of the Soul towards *Christ* ? Whether only *Faith* in *Christ* justifie, and not *Faith* in *God the Father*, or belief of the *Promise*, or of *Heaven* ? &c. Of all which briefly.

§. 2. I. The word [*Receiving*] (*Christ, Grace, &c.*) hath two different senses necessarily to be distinguished : 1. *Physical Receiving* is the strict sense, as *patis* and *recipere* are all one : Which is, 1. To receive the meer *Act* of the *Agent terminatively* ; or, 2. To receive a *further effect* of that *Act*.

2. *Mo-*

2. *Moral receiving* is nothing but accepting of an offered thing by *consent* of *Will*: And so to receive supposeth an offer, and is nothing but *Consent* to it.

§. 3. To receive *Grace* in the strict, *physical* sence, is to be made *gracious*, or to be the Patients of the Operation of *Grace* if it be real: But to receive *relative Grace* *physically*, is nothing but to be made so *related*: So to receive *Sanctification* is to be sanctified, and to receive *Justification* or *Pardon*, is nothing but to be justified or pardoned.

§. 4. But how is *Christ* himself physically received? That were easily known, if you knew how he is *physically given*. But for a Gift of *Christ's* person by *physical attingency*, we can say nothing of it by Scripture-warrant, that I know of: It is no matter for our Disputes. But in two sences *Christ* is said to be given to us: 1. In *Relation*, as a *King* to his Subjects, or a *Husband* to his Wife: And so we *physically receive* those *Relations*, as aforesaid: That is, we are made *related to him*. 2. In the real *Communication* of the *Spirit of Christ* to us: And so we *physically receive* the *Spirit* in its operations; that is, He worketh them on us: This is the first sence of *Receiving*.

§. 4. But *morally* to receive *Grace*, or *Christ*, is but to *consent* that *Grace* and *Christ* be ours: As a *Subject*, a *Servant*, a *Wife*, consent to their Relation; and this is our *Faith*, and not the former.

§. 5. Where note, That *moral Receiving* (or *Consent*) is but a *Means* of *physical Receiving* (or *Having*) and a means which maketh not the thing ours any otherwise, than as the *Will* of the *Giver* doth appoint, and give it its Power thereunto.

This

This *moral receiving* or *accepting* is but *dispositio recipientis*, as to *having* or *physical reception*; as there must be in all things *dispositio materia ad formam recipiendam*: He that will not accept the Gift, is accounted by the Giver *morally unfit* for it.

§. 6. But this is not spoken of *every Gift*; but of such as are offered by the Giver on the *Condition of thankful acceptance*. For God giveth many things *absolutely*; as Christ was given to be Man's Redeemer, and Christ gave his *Covenant, Gospell, and Apostles*, and sendeth the word to many that before have it not, and giveth the first Grace, which causeth mens *acceptance* of the other, and all this not on the *Condition* of their acceptance: But the Gifts bestowed by the *Baptismal Covenant* of Grace, are all given on *Condition* of our *moral receiving* or *acceptance*.

§. 7. This necessary distinction of *receiving* being premised, I answer the question as followeth: 1. To be justified, is to be the *physical Receiver* of God's *justifying act*, and nothing else in proper sense.

§. 8. 2. No man physically receiveth Christ's Person (as far as we can prove or understand) nor Christ's own *Righteousness in it self*; but we *physically receive* our *relation to Christ*, and the *Spirits operations*, and our *Right to Impunity and Life*.

§. 9. 3. We at once *sensu physico*, receive our *relation to Christ* as our *Head*, that is, our *redeeming Owner, Ruler and Saviour*, or *Prophet, as Priest and King*; and not to one first, and to another after.

§. 10. 4. In the same instant of time that we receive our *relation to Christ*, as aforesaid, we receive *with him*, as his *Grace*, by the same *donative act*

act of the Covenant, our Right to *Impunity* and *Life*, even to the complacential special Love of the Father, and the Communion of the Holy Ghost, and so are justified.

§. 11. 5. Our *moral receiving* of Christ himself as our Saviour, is the antecedent Condition of our foresaid physical reception or participation, being appointed by God to that use or office.

§. 12. 6. This *moral receiving* is that *Faith* which I before at large described, and is sometime called *Believing*, and sometime *Trusting*, because it is in whole a *believing fiducial Consent*.

§. 13. 7. This Belief and Consent or Acceptance, hath essentially for its object *all that is essential to Christ*, as our Saviour; his Natures, Person, his Humiliation, Obedience, his Sacrifice and Resurrection, his Intercession, Dominion, Judgment, together with his Doctrine, Promises, and Grace; besides God himself and the Heavenly Glory: And it is not true Faith that hath not all this, at least confusedly and in some degree.

§. 14. 8. They that say, *Faith justifieth as it receiveth Christ's Righteousness*, and not as it receiveth *Christ himself in relation*, or at least not as *Teacher, Lord, Intercessor, &c.* do draw men into deceit by a Phrase which intimateth a false supposition, or two, *viz.* 1. It is false that *Faith justifieth us*, if they mean *efficiently*; as shall be shewed anon. But it is true, (though some deny it) that *Faith justifieth constitutively*, so far as it is it self our *personal inherent Righteousness*, (of which after): But this they mean not: Nor is *Faith in Christ's righteousness* any more our *inherent Righteousness* than *Faith in his Promises*,
his

his Intercession or his Government, or in God the Father. 2. It is false, that Faith *as Faith* doth justify; either as it is Faith in this or that or the other part of the Office of Christ; for then we should be justified, as they call it, by *what* *to credere*; and then if God had not made Faith the Condition of Justification, yet *quatalis* it would have justified.

§. 15. 9. But the Case is very plain: There is considerable in Faith, 1. *Its Nature*, and that is only its *material Aptitude* to its Office: 2. The *Office it self*, and that is to be the *Condition* appointed by God the Donor, of our Interest in his Gifts (and so of Justification). Now it justifieth not *efficiently* at all (unless you take Justification for making us *Holy*). But it is the *Condition* of Justification, and so we are said to be justified by it as by a *Condition*; but it is not a Condition, *quafides*, or as it receiveth Christ's Righteousness, but as it is made by God a *Condition* in his Covenant. But Faith, *as Faith in Christ*, is the *Matter* of this Condition: Or its *Aptitude* to its Office is in Faith *quatalis*: And no other had been so fit: But then it is not only our belief or acceptance of Christ's Righteousness that is this Aptitude: Nothing but *entire Faith in its essentials* is this *matter and aptitude*, and the formal reason of its place or office about our Justification, is its being the *Condition* appointed thereto in the Instrument of Donation.

§. 16. 10. Were the Question about *physical Receiving*, it were true, that a man is justified *quatenus*, as he receiveth Justification, and adopted as he receiveth Adoption, and sanctified as he receiveth Sanctification, and glorified as he receiveth Glorification,

cation, and not something else ; as he is rich as he receiveth Riches, and honourable as he receiveth Honour, &c. But *moral acceptance* of one thing is oft made the Condition of our *having another thing* ; and here our acceptance of *whole Christ* is our *undivided Condition-title* to him and his Gifts. We are no more justified for or by consenting to be justified, than for or by consenting to be sanctified, and to learn of *Christ*, and obey him.

§. 17. Yea more ; men use to put that into the Condition of something which the Person fain would have, which he is more backward to, and would not else do or have. A Physician useth not to say, *Thou shalt be cured if thou consent to be cured ; but if thou consent to take my Medicines and follow my Prescript.* A Father will not say to the Child, I will give thee this Apple if thou wilt have it ; but if thou wilt thank me for it, and do thy Duty : So if we might make a difference in the reason of the thing, we should say, That God saith not only, *Thou shalt have Christ's righteousness, or justification by it, if thou wilt have it ;* no more than [*Thou shalt be saved from Hell if thou wilt*] (and who would not be forgiven ?) But [*thou shalt have Christ and Life, Pardon, Grace and Glory, if thou wilt thankfully take them together as they are, or wilt be taught and ruled by Christ, and renounce the World, the Flesh, and the Devil, and take God and Glory for thy all.*]

§. 18. Christ's own righteousness being not essentially given to us in it self, but given for us ; and so us in the Effects, to say, That the receiving of that which is not given, is the only justifying act of Faith, is to say, That we are not justified by Faith at all. But if they mean the Effects of Christ's Righteousness, then

then it is but to say, *We are justified by no act of Faith, but by consenting to be justified by Christ's Merits*: Which is not true.

§. 19. They contradict themselves that make Christ's Priestly Office the *only Object* of Justifying Faith, and yet make his *whole Righteousness and Merit* that Object: For who knoweth not, that all Christ's Righteousness was not performed by him only as Priest.

§. 20. And Christ's Priesthood hath many other actions belonging to it, besides his Merits offered for us: Even his present *Intercession*: Which must be excluded, if Christ's Righteousness here, as under the Law, were the only Object of this Faith.

§. 21. II. The second Question I had never troubled the World about so much as I have done, had I not found too many Protestants scandalize the Papists, by laying too much on the Nation of *Instrumentality*, ill explained. But the judicious are here all in fence of the same mind.

§. 22. For by an *Instrument* they mean not,
 1. an instrumental efficient Cause of Justification:
 2. Nor of making Christ's Righteousness ours:
 For we give it not to our selves. 3. But they take the word *Instrument* mechanically or less accurately, and tell us, that they mean a *receiving Instrument*, as a Boy * catcheth a Ball in his Hat: But so as that it is a *moral Instrument*, that is, both *materially a moral act*, and the *Instrument of a moral not physical reception*.

§. 23. But when they have all done, they do but entangle and trouble themselves and others with an unapt Logical notion: For (as it is so easie to
 T confute

confute the gross Conceit, That Faith is an *instrumental efficient Cause* (either God's or Man's) of our Justification ; (which I have done so oft, that I will here pretermitt it, so) this Notion of a *Passive Instrument* is unapt, because, 1. The Act of *Assent* is essential to this justifying Faith, as well as *Acceptance*; and so is *Trust*, which yet are no more *Instrumental* in reception, than many other Acts, even Love, Desire, Hope. 2. Because our *Consent* to other things, as well as to be justified, and our *Faith in God the Father*, are as truly the Condition of our *Justification*, as our *Consent to be justified*. 3. And because this Metaphorical use of the Word *Instrument*, leadeth people to dream of proper Instrumentality, and misleadeth them from the apter Notions: The Covenant-Donation is the justifying Instrument.

§. 24. I conclude therefore summarily, 1. *Faith, as Faith in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, in the Sence of the *Baptismal Covenant*, is the apt Matter to be the Condition of our Justification by the Gift of that Covenant.

2. If Justification be taken for *making us just Performers* of the Conditions of the Covenant of Grace; so Faith justifieth us, 1. Constitutively initially, as it is the beginning of that Righteousness it self. 2. And by a *moral efficiency*, as it is a cause of Love and Obedience.

3. If Justification be taken for the Gift, or right to Impunity and Life in and with Christ, so Faith is the Condition of it, and no otherwise justifieth.

4. But if any will call this by the name of a *Submerit*, with the Ancients, meaning but that it meriteth Justification, as a Child meriteth a piece of

of Gold from his Father, by putting off his Hat, and saying, I thank you, and humbly taking it, instead of scornful or neglectful refusing it, I will not quarrel with any such.

§. 25. But remember, that as wise men seldom make any thing a *Condition of a gift*, which hath no worth in it to please them; so God saw, and put such a worth or aptitude in Faith, or else he had not so much as commanded it.

§. 26. But yet a *Condition* simply as such, signifieth neither *Merit* nor *Causality* at all; but only the terms on which the gift shall be suspended, till they be performed: And so the performance of a *Condition* as such, is no efficient of the gift, but a removing of the suspending impediment.

§. 27. Therefore Dr. Twisse oft calleth Faith *Causam dispositivam justificationis*, which belongeth not to the efficient, but material or recipient Cause; and the true *Legal* Notion of its next Interest in our Justification, is its being [*Conditio praestita*] and the true *Logical* Notion is to be [*Dispositio moralis materiae, sive subjecti recipientis*] call it *Causam vel Conditionem dispositivam*, as you please: And I think this Question needs no more.

§. 28. III. As to the third Question, the truth is obvious, That *Christ's righteousness is imputed*, and yet *Faith is imputed to us for righteousness* in several Sences; that is, each is reputed to be to us what indeed it is. Two things make up the Sence of *Faith's being imputed to us for righteousness*: i. Faith is really the *Condition* of the *Covenant of Grace*, which whoso performeth, he is righteous against the Charge of *Non-performance* of that *Condition*; and it is reputed our *subordinate, Evangelical*

eal, personal, righteousness: 2. And supposing Christ's Merits and our Redemption by him, this Gospel-righteousness is all that is required *of us on our parts*, instead of all that perfect Obedience which the Law of Innocency required. So that our Faith (taken in the Scripture-sence) is our *real righteousness* related to the Condition of the New Covenant, and *instead of a more perfect righteousness of Innocency*; forasmuch as after Christ's Redemption, is required to be performed by our selves.

§. 29. This, no Christians that are sober, can deny, as to the thing: And as to the *Name*, it is plain to the impartial that will see that *Paul*, Rom. 4. 22, 23, 24. and *Jam.* 2. 23. by *Faith* means *Faith* it self indeed, and not only *Christ* the Object of *Faith*, as some affirm, with too great Scandal: read over the Texts, and try what Sence it will be, if you put [*Christ*] instead of [*Faith*.]

§. 30. Obj. *But it is not Faith in, and of it self that's meant, but as connoting the Object.* Ans. The latter clause is true: it is *Faith*, as connoting the Object, *Christ*: But the former is a contradiction. For *Faith* it self essentially connoteth the Object: If you speak not of *Faith* in genere (for it is not any kind of *Faith* that is our righteousness) but of the *Christian*, or *New Covenant Faith* in specie, who knoweth not that the Object specifieth it? And therefore if it be *Christian faith*, as connoting the Object, it is *Christian faith* as *Christian faith*.

§. 31. But will any sober Christian deny, that *Christ* is our *righteousness* in one sence, and *Faith* subordinately in another, and that both are accordingly imputed to us? How fain would some men differ

differ, if they could, or seem to do it, when they do not?

§. 32. IV. As to the fourth Question, I answer, 1. We are all agreed, That God will not pardon, justify, or save any, without both *Faith* and *Repentance*, and *Desire*, as necessary moral Qualifications of the Receiver: And this shall serve turn, if any like not the term [*Condition*] and be willing to be quiet.

§. 33. 2. Faith in a narrow Sense, as signifying *meer Assent*, is distinct from *Repentance*; but *Faith* in that sense as is meant in Baptism, and hath the Promise of Justification and Life, is more the same with *Repentance* than many perceive. For *Repentance* is the change of the mind from *evil to good*? And the Good necessary to our Salvation, is a *fiducial practical Consent* to the Covenant of *Grace*, or a *practical Faith in God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*: And to turn to *this*, is to repent and be converted; even to turn from the contrary Acts and Objects to this fiducial consenting Belief in God the Father, Son, and Spirit; and what else is *repenting*, but *this Change*?

§. 34. 3. It was never *Paul's* meaning, under the name of *Works*, to exclude *Repentance*, and all Acts of Faith, save one, and Thankfulness, and Desire, and Hope, and Prayer, &c. while they keep their place in subordination to Christ: They do but confound sacred Doctrines and mens minds, that so imagine.

§. 35. And the same Spirit that saith, *He that believeth, shall be saved*, saith also, *He that calleth*

on the Name of the Lord, shall be saved, Rom. 10. 13. And we are saved by Hope, Rom. A&T. 12. 21. 8. 24. and we are saved by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost, Tit. 3. 5, 6. and by believing the Articles of the Creed, 1 Cor. 15. 2. and blessed are they that keep his Commandments, that they may have right to the Tree of Life (that right is our righteousness) and may enter in, &c. Rev. 22. 14. By taking heed to himself and to Doctrine, Timothy was to save himself and his Hearers, 1 Tim. 4. 16. Many such Texts I have elsewhere cited, which are all true.

S. 36. V. As to the fifth Question, it is answered before in the Description of Faith: As the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, are one God, so Faith in them is, one Faith; and no man can truly believe in Christ, that believeth not in the Father; our belief in God, as God, and Love to him, is that Salvation to which Christ is to bring us: And the Consent to use the remedy, includeth the consent to have Health or to be saved: And our Belief in God, as our Redeemer, even Christ, is the chief part of our mediate Faith: In a word; all that Belief which is necessary to the Baptized, is necessary to our Justification: But that is our Belief in Father, Son, and Holy Ghost (in the measure that they are revealed.)

CHAP. XXIV.

Of Assurance of our Justification, and of Hope.

§. 1. **A**ssurance of *Perseverance* and *Salvation*, is not here to be spoken of, but only of our *present Justification*: And they are distinct Questions. 1. What Assurance is *desirable*. 2. What Assurance is *attainable*. 3. What Assurance we *actually have*, and who have it. 4. What is the *nature and grounds* of this Assurance.

§. 2. I. Some pleaded so much for the usefulness of *Uncertainty* and *Doubling*, as if it were the safest condition to keep us humble and watchful, as excited *Luther* and other Reformers to take them for utter Enemies to Christian Comfort. And certainly Assurance is a most *desirable* thing; it kindleth in us the *love of God*; it maketh *Duty sweet*; it maketh *Sufferings easie*, and *Death less terrible*, and *Heaven more desired*, and consequently cureth an *earthly Mind*, and leadeth man to a *heavenly Conversation*, and putteth *Life* into all his *Endeavours*: Whereas a man that is still *utterly in doubt* of his state of *Salvation*, and right to *Life*, will be loath to die, and therefore *love this present World*, and have less thankful and loving Thoughts of *God* and his Redeemer, and so all sin will have advantage, and Holiness a great impediment. An Infidel will confess, that such Assurance is exceeding desirable.

§. 3. II. And no doubt but a comfortable *degree* of Assurance is *attainable*, or else God would never have so fully differenced the Righteous and the Wicked, and commanded all to examine and try themselves, and to make sure : But this I have often elsewhere proved.

§. 4. III. But all true Believers have not Assurance of their Justification, because they are not certain that their Faith is such as hath the promise of Justification : He that believeth perceiveth that he believeth, but yet may be uncertain that his Faith is so sincere, as no unjustified man can have.

§. 5. Their Justification is real, or true, or certain in it self ; but the Evidence of it may be dark, and their perception of the Evidence defective ; from whence it is to them uncertain ; that is, not known with that full satisfaction of mind, which we call Assurance.

§. 6. Yea, Experience telleth us, That it is but a *small part* of the most *religious Christians*, who will say themselves, That they are *certain* of their *Justification* ; and of those few that are forwardest to *say so*, all have it not.

§. 7. Therefore *justifying Faith* is not Assurance that we are *justified* ; otherwise all should have assurance that have Faith ; and *justifying Faith* in order of Nature, goeth before *Justification*, but Assurance that we are *justified*, followeth it ; we cannot be *assured* that we are *justified*, but by being assured that we *believe* : But it's absurd to say, [I am assured I am justified, because I am assured that I am justified.] But this is only against the *Antinomians*.

§. 8.

§. 8. No man hath *perfect Assurance*, that is the highest degree in this Life: For if *all our Graces* be *imperfect*, our Assurance must needs be imperfect.

§. 9. IV. This *Assurance* then is not properly *Divine Faith*, or a *Belief of God's Word*; but it is a clear and satisfying perception of our own *Justification*, because we are clearly satisfied, that *God's Promises are true*, and that we are true Believers.

§. 10. This Certainty is not by an *immediate Word* or *Revelation* of the Spirit in us; but yet the Spirit is all these ways the cause of it in the Faithful. 1. The Spirit working us to *God's Image and Will*, is our *assuring-Evidence*, or the *Minor* in that Argument, whose Conclusion we are assured of (as the Spirit in the Word is the *Major*.) 2. The Spirit in Believers helpeth them to *perceive* his *own Works* in them, and know their Evidence: 3. And also to *rejoyce* in that perception. This is the Witness of the Spirit which we mean, and not *immediate Revelation*.

§. 11. Though *Hope* be sometimes about things certain, yet it is often also about that which we are not certain of: And more have *true Hopes* of *Salvation*, than have *Assurance* of it, or of their Title to it: For *Hope* may be exercised upon probabilities, and most usually it is so.

§. 12. *Strong Probability*, with little reason of doubting, may cause such strong *Hopes* as may cause us to live and die with comfort: If *doubting* be small, and *Hope* be great, the *Peace* and *Joy* will be greater than the *fear* and *trouble*.

§. 13. *Bellarmin's Moral Certainty* is more than most Christians attain to, and his, and other mens Concession thereof tell us, That in this Point our difference is less than those have thought, who have said it was *sufficient Cause of our Separation from Rome*:

§. 14. While we are certain that *this World is fading Vanity*, and that there is no hope of *Felicity on Earth*, and that therefore Godliness can cost us the loss of nothing but *Vanity*, a *Faith short of Certainty*, and mixt with *doubting*, about the very *Truth of the Promise it self*, and *Life Eternal*, may engage a man savingly in a holy Life, and the forsaking of all for the hopes of Glory: And such doubting, even of the Life to come, or of the Gospel, as keepeth not men from trusting to it for their Felicity, and seeking it above all, and forsaking all for it, will keep no man from Salvation, though it be his sin, and the cause of other sins.

Much more may this be done when men doubt not of God's Word, or the State of Glory, but only of their own Sincerity, Justification and Salvation.

C H A P. XXV.

Of good Works and Merit, and trusting to any thing of our own.

§. 1. **H**ere are several Controversies that trouble our Peace, but few of them that are so great as they are commonly imagined:
As,

As, 1. What are good Works (which indeed is of great weight, and the chief in which we really differ about Works.) 2. Whether they are necessary to Justification or Salvation. 3. Whether they are meritorious or rewardable. 4. What place they have, and what is their use and necessity. 5. Whether we may trust to them.

§. 2. I. It is one of the Devil's chief Policies in the World, to cast out Christ's Interest by its *Counterfeits*: To expugn true Wisdom by counterfeit Wisdom, and true Faith by counterfeit Faith, and true Zeal and Piety by counterfeit Zeal and Piety, and true Unity, and Concord, and Peace, by their Counterfeits, and true Worship, Ministry, Discipline, by their Counterfeits; and true Comfort by counterfeit Comfort; and so also it is by *counterfeit good Works*, that *good Works* are oft cast off.

§. 3. The measure of all created Goodness, is the *Will* of the Creator, who is the prime, essential Good; and no Work of Man is morally good, but what is made so by the *will* of God; that is, 1. *Efficiently*, by his *operative Will*: 2. *Directively*, by his *commanding Will*: And, 3. *Finally* and *Objectively*, by his *pleased, or fulfilled will*. Man's *Wis, Will, or Interest* cannot serve to make any action morally good.

§. 4. He that *intendeth God's Honour*, and the *pleasing of his Will*, and the good of his own or others Souls, or the safety of Religion, or the Church, or State, and *useth means* hereto, not commanded, or any way appointed him of God (much more if directly forbidden) doth not a Work that is truly good, but only *secundum quid*.

§. 5.

§. 5. Could we be sure that such a Work would *save Souls, or save Church, or State, or our Neighbours lives*, it would not make it *morally* a good Work; but only make the *Effect* to be *physically* good to others that are benefited by it.

§. 6. Therefore to *build Churches, or Hospitals, to feed and cloath the Poor, to save Mens Lives, to preach the Gospel*, are all such as finally do a *physical* good, and they are the *matter of moral* good; but *forma denominat*: Those Actions are not *morally* good, unless, 1. done in *obedience* to God's commanding, or *ruling* Will: 2. And finally to *please his Will*.

§. 7. Those Priests therefore that set carnal, ungodly Sinners (Fornicators, Murderers, Gluttons, Drunkards, Lyers, Perjured, &c.) on expiating their Sins by *good Works*, without teaching and perswading them to that *internal repentance*, and *Conversion of their Wills*, and *holy devotedness to God*, by which their *Works* must have a right *Principle, End, and Form*, do but delude men, and cheat them by flattery into perdition.

§. 8. Much more pernicious is it, to take *Sin, Folly, and Superstition*, for *good Works*, and look to be saved by that which deserveth Damnation, and to *expiate sin by sin*; such are the Works of *Persecutors* that think they serve God by unjust killing, or imprisoning his Servants, or causeless silencing his faithful Ministers; such were the Wars of the *Croisade's* against the *Waldenses* and *Albigenses*; and such are the Works of the Inquisition, and their persecuting Executioners; such are *Rebellions* that have fair Pretences, as were those against the *German Emperors, Fredericks, Henry, &c.* and of many of such Agents oft against the
Kings

Kings of *England*; such hath been the zealous killing of Kings, and burning of honest desirable Dissenters; and such is the alienating *Mens Estates* from *better Uses*, to maintain a supernumerous sinful, vicious, idle Monastery, or their prelatical needless Pomp and Pride; or to buy Pardons or Masses for *departed Souls*; or to build *useless Structures* to the Honour of some Saint or Angel; or to set up *useless Formalities and Shadows*, as Candles by day-light, and abundance such: And such are long *Pilgrimages* to the Shrines of such as the Pope hath Canonized, and to visit Relicks, and the carrying about of Relicks, with an ungrounded carnal confidence in them; with many such like.

§. 9 So wofully hath the Papal Party, and not they only, but in too great a measure, the *Greeks*, *Moscovites*, *Armenians*, *Syrians*, *Coptics*, *Abassines*, and most of the Churches corrupted the Christian Religion by their useles or seducing Poperies called *good Works*, that they have among them defiled its Purity, rejected its Primitive Simplicity, obscured and dishonoured its Glory, and made it seem contemptible to *Mahometans* and Heathens, and made it less fit to destroy sin, and frustrate Satan, and to please God, and to sanctifie and save mens Souls.

§. 10. II. Were all Sects and Parties of Christians, well agreed what *Works are truly good*, it would be a shame to us, should we not agree in the main *how far they are necessary*, when the Case is so plain throughout the Scripture: I think we are commonly agreed as followeth.

§. 11.

§. 11. 1. *Perfect Obedience* is not of absolute necessity to Salvation, because we are under a Covenant that hath easier terms.

§. 12. 2. The Works of the Mosaical Jewish Law, are neither necessary *necessitate praecepti vel medii*, that Law not binding us as such.

§. 13. 3. Obedience to Man's Laws is not necessary, when the matter is forbidden us by God's Laws, or when they are Laws without power; that is, such as men have no Authority to make.

§. 14. 4. No Works of special Grace are antecedently necessary to our reception of that Grace, or of its necessary means.

§. 15. 5. No *external acts of sincere Obedience*, distinct from internal Faith, and Repentance, and Consent, are necessary before to our first Justification; that is, to our right to Impunity and life in Christ.

§. 16. 6. Even *internal Obedience to Christ as Christ*, distinct from our Obedience to God as God, and our *Subjection to Christ* (or Consent to be his *Subjects*, and obey him) is not before necessary to our part in Christ, or our Union, or Justification, as in its first state or beginning.

§. 17. 7. Therefore if we should suppose that a Man should die immediately upon his first *internal Faith and Consent* to the Covenant, before he had time to do one Act internal or external of formal *Obedience to Christ, as Christ*; that Man would be saved. But the Supposition is so utterly improbable, that it is not to be put as a matter of Dispute: The Thief on the Cross performed some Obedience.

§. 18. 8. No Works of Man's are necessary to profit God, or can add to his Perfection or Felicity: He needeth not us nor any of our doings.

§. 19. 9. No Works of ours are necessary to make up any defects in the Merits of Christ, or to any use which is proper to Christ or his Merits or efficacious Grace.

§. 20. 10. No *preparatory Works* of Man's (I think) are *absolutely* before necessary to God's effectual converting of him, (unless you will call the Acts of Nature, by which he is fit to hear and think, preparatory Works unfitly): For God *can give* his Grace to unprepared Souls.

§. 21. On the affirmative also we are agreed,
1. That all Mankind are under God's Government by some Law, and owe Him Obedience to that Law.

§. 22. 2. That it is only Disobedience that God punisheth according to the Penal part of that Law which men live under.

§. 23. 3. That it is only *Obedience* which God rewardeth, according to the rewarding or promissory part of the Law that men are under.

§. 24. 4. That the Law of Grace (and not only that of Innocency) hath its Commands of Obedience, and Promises of Reward.

§. 25. 5. That men must believe that there is a God before they can believe that Christ is the Anointed of God and the Mediator between God and man; and therefore must first believe God's Sovereign Government!

§. 26.

§. 26. 6. God *commandeth* men to believe in Christ, (and so maketh it their Duty) and to take him for their Lord and Saviour by Faith.

• §. 27. 7. Men ought thus to believe in Christ and accept him, in *obedience* to this Command of God, believing that it is *his Will*.

§. 28. 8. Therefore there is some sort of *Belief in God*, and *Obedience to God*, which is in order before our *Faith in Christ*: And *Faith in Christ as it is voluntary and free*, is an Act of such *Obedience to God*.

§. 29. 9. Yet is it the *antecedent Teaching* of Christ (by *Nature*, by the *Word*, or *Spirit*, or *all*) by which we now come to know God to be God, and that he is to be believed and obeyed. Therefore Christ is mens *Teacher*, and thereby *bringeth them to believe first in God*, before he is *known to be their Teacher*, and *believed on himself*. As the Sunbeams before its rising give some Light to the Earth.

§. 30. 10. God hath commanded men that hear not of Christ, the use of some means, which Mercy hath (through Christ) afforded them, which have a tendency to their Salvation, and should be used to that end. And his bare Command to use such means (much more as seconded with abundance of Mercies) tell us, that he bids not men use them in vain, or without any hope of good success (of which before).

§. 31. 11. He that *heareth* of Christ and *believeth not*, or *believeth uneffectually*, and is not a converted sound Believer, is under God's Command to use certain means allowed him, to procure *Faith and true Conversion*, and that not without all hope of good success.

§. 32. 12. It is God's ordinary way to give his first special converting Grace, to predisposed Subjects, prepared by his commoner Grace; in which Preparation some Acts of Man have their part: And the unprepared and undisposed cannot equally expect it.

§. 33. 13. Faith and Repentance are Acts of Man, and pre-requisite to Justification: Therefore as Acts and Works are words of the same sence, so Works, even Works of Special Grace are pre-requisite to Justification.

Obj. But not as Acts, but for the Object.
 Answ. That's a contradiction. Christ is Christ whether we believe in him or not; and it's one thing to say Christ is necessary, and another thing to say, Believing in him is necessary: It is not necessary meerly as an Act in genere, but as this Act in specio; and it is specified (as is aforesaid) by its Object. Not only Christ believed in, but Believing in Christ is pre-requisite as a moral disposition to Justification: And in that sence a Work or Act of Man.

§. 34. 14. It is before shewed, that this Faith is a moral Work, containing (not one only, but) many physical acts: He that believeth in Christ, believeth in him as sent of God, to reconcile us to God, to bring us to Glory, to save us from Justice, Sin, and Enemies, to sanctifie us by his Word and Spirit, with many such acts that make up the Essence of Saving-Faith: This is the Work of God, that ye believe on him whom the Father hath sent, Joh. 6. 28, 29.

§. 35. 15. The Faith that hath the Promise of Justification, is essentially a subjecting our selves to Christ; that is, a taking him for our Lord and

Saviour by Consent: Which is a Consent to obey him for the future.

§. 36. 16. Though this *actual Obedience* to Christ (besides *Subjection*) be not pre-requisite to our first being justified, it is requisite to the Continuance of our Justification: For we consented to obey, that we might *indeed obey*, and are perfidious if we do not.

§. 37. 17. The *World and Conscience* will judge us much according to our Works.

§. 38. 18. The same Law of Grace being the Rule of *Duty* and of *Judgment*, God will judge all men according to their Works, required by that Law, by justifying or condemning them.

§. 39. 19. Final justification and glorification are the Rewards of Evangelical Obedience; and the reason rendered of Christ's justifying Sentence, *Math. 25. (& passim)* is from such acts of Man, as qualifying them for the free Gift of God.

§. 40. 20. There is a *moral goodness* in these Works of Man, by which through Christ, they are *pleasing to God*, which is their aptitude to this acceptance and reward.

In all this I think all sober Christians must needs confess that they agree.

§. 41. III. And as to the Case of *Merit*, a few words with understanding men may dispatch it. We are agreed on the negative; 1. That no Man or Angel can *merit* of God in proper Commutative Justice, giving him somewhat for his Benefits that shall profit him, or to which he had not absolute right.

2. No man can merit any thing of God, upon the terms of the Law of Innocency, (but Punishment.)

3. No man can merit any thing of God, unless it be supposed first to be a *free Gift* and *merited by Christ*.

§. 42. And affirmatively we are (I think), agreed; 1. That God governeth us by a Law of Grace, which hath a Promise or Premiant part, which giveth (not the *antecedent*, but many *consequent* benefits) by way of *Reward*: To deny the *rewarding act*, is to deny God's *Law*, and the manner of his Government.

§. 43. 2. That God calleth it *his Justice* to reward men according to his Law, and give them what it gave them right to. Inſomuch, that it is made the ſecond Article of our Faith, *Heb. 11. 6.* to believe that *God is the rewarder of them that diligently ſeek him*. And he giveth it *as a righteous Judge*, *2 Tim. 4. 8.*

§. 44. 3. That this ſuppoſeth that ſuch Works of Man have a *moral Aptitude* for that *Reward*; which conſiſteth in theſe things: 1. That they are *efficiently* from God's Spirit. 2. They are in their *meaſure* agreeable to God's governing Will. 3. They are done in Love, to his glory, and to pleaſe him. 4. They are done by a *Member* of Chriſt. 5. They are *profitable to Men*, our ſelves and others. 6. The Habits and Acts are God's *own Image*. 7. They have the Promise of his *Reward*. 8. They are waſhed in the *Blood of Chriſt*, that is, *Their faultineſs is pardoned through his Merits*. 9. They are preſented to God by *Chriſt's Interceſſion*. 10. And laſtly, they are Man's *Aptitude* for the *Reward* in their *very nature*; yea,

part of it themselves as they are of God; *Holiness* being the beginning of *Happiness*, or of that love of God which in its *Perfection* is *Heaven it self*: Such an *Aptitude*, as that a *holy person* cannot be *miserable*, nor can God hate and damn a *holy Soul* that truly loveth and obeyeth him.

§. 45. 4. This *moral Aptitude* for the Reward is *amiable* and *pleasing to God*; and therefore he calleth the Reward in the Gospel usually *μισθός*, which properly signifieth *Wages*, which men give by *Commutative Justice*: But that is only *metaphorically*, because God that cannot be *profited* by man, is yet *pleased* in that which *profiteth our selves* and one another, and *glorifieth him* by declaring his *Perfections*: And as if this were *profiting him*, he calleth it *Wages*, for some similitude, but not in proper sence.

§. 46. 5. This *moral Aptitude*, for the Reward is called oft in Scripture *Worthiness*, *ἀξια*, which is of the same signification with *Merit*: To be *worthy* and to *deserve*, are here all one: So that so far *Merit* (*Worthiness*) is a Scripture Phrase.

§. 47. 6. This *Worthiness* or *Merit* is only in point of *Paternal Governing-Justice*, according to the *Law of Grace*, ordering that which in it self is a *free Gift merited by Christ*.

§. 48. For no Man or Angel can have any thing of God, but by *free Gift*: What have we which we receive not, when our *being* is of God? Therefore it must be of *governing oracring Justice* only: The *thing* is a *Gift*: but God will give this *Gift to his Children* so wisely as to the *Order* of it, as shall be fittest to attain his ends. Therefore it is not by *Governing Justice* after the *Law of Innocency or Works*, but according to the *Law of Grace*.

Grace. So that the sum of the Solution is, That
 1. the Good received in its *value*, as *Good* is of
 God as a *Benefactor* and a *free Gift*. 2. But in
Order of Collation, it is of God as a *wise* and *righte-*
ous Governour, even a *governing Father*, and so on-
 ly it is a *Reward*, and so it is *merited*.

§. 49. This is easily understood by *Parents*,
 who intend to give their *Children* freely, out of
 meer love, their *Inheritance*, and what else they
 want: And yet they will give them *Gold* or
Clothes or *Food*, in so wise a manner, as shall
 engage them to their *Duty*, and will say, *Put off*
your Hat and thank me, or *Do this or that* (which
 is for their own good) and *I will give you this*.
 Here it is a *Gift* as to the *Goodness*, and a *Reward*
 as to the *order of giving it*.

§. 50. 7. The ancient Christians (as the *Wri-*
tings of all the *Ancients* commonly shew) did use
 the word *Merit* without any scruple; and I re-
 member not that any Christians did ever gainsay it
 or take the use of it for a fault: Yet did they
 contradict mens carnal erroneous *Conceits* of
Man's Merit, as well as we: Yet now our oppo-
 sition to *Popery* hath brought the word into so
 great distaste with many good Protestants, as that
 they take it to signifie some dangerous self-arro-
 gating Doctrine: So great is the power of Preju-
 dice and Contest.

§. 51. It is true, That when Hereticks have put
 an ill sence upon a good word, we must use it more
 cantelously than at other times and places: But if
 thence we absolutely reject and accuse it, we shall
 harden our *Adversaries*, and strengthen the Error
 which we oppose, by running into the contrary
 extream, which will soon disgrace it self.

§. 52. It is a great advantage to the Papists, that many Protestants wholly disclaim the word, and simply deny the *Merit of Gospel-obedience*: For hereupon the Teachers shew their Scholars, that all the *Fathers speak for Merit*, and so tell them, that the Protestants Doctrine is new and heretical, as being contrary to all the ancient Doctors: And when their Scholars see it with their Eyes, no wonder if they believe it, to our dishonour.

§. 53. All Orthodox Christians hold the fore-described Doctrine of *Merit* in sense, though not in words: For they that deny *Merit*, confess the [*Rewardableness*] of our Obedience, and confess that the Scripture useth the term [*Worthy*] and that ἀξίον and ἀξια may be translated *Meriting* and *Merit*, as well as *Worthy* and *Worthiness*; and we think it fitter to expound such Scripture-words than to accuse and reject them: And they all confess, that *man's Duty hath God's Promise of Reward*, and that *Holiness* in its nature is suitable to the End or Reward, as disposing us to enjoy it, and is pleasing unto God and glorifieth him: And this is all the same thing in other words, which the ancient Christians meant by *Merit*. And to hear many godly persons at the same time, most earnestly extol Holiness, and desire that Preachers should convince the People that the *Righteous is more excellent than his Neighbour*, and yet denying all *Merit*, and reviling all that assert it; this doth but shew, that they understand not the word; and think others also misunderstand it: And so we are reproaching one another, where we are agreed and know it not: Like the Woman that turned away her Servant upon the Controversie, Whether the
House

House should be swept with a *Broom* or with a *Besom*; or the Physicians that let the Patient die, because they could not agree whether he should take a *Potion* or a *Draught*, a *bit* or a *morsel*, or take *Ambar*, or *Electrum* or *Succinum* or *Carrabe*.

§. 54. And the partial Teachers are the Cause of all this, while instead of opening the Doctrine truly to the People, in what sence we have or have not any *Worthiness* or *Merit*, they without distinction cry down *Merit*, and reproach those that do otherwise: And if they do but say, [*Such a Man* or *such a Book* *speaketh* for *Merit* and *Free-will*] they have sufficiently rendered him odious or much suspected with their followers; when yet all sober Christians in all Ages have been for *Merit* and *Free-will* in a sound sence: And is not this to be Incendiaries and Adversaries to Truth, and Love, and Peace?

§. 55. I have formerly thought, that though we agree in the thing, it is best omit the *name*, because the Papists have abused it: And I think so still, as in such Companies and Cases where the use of it not understood will scandalize men, and do more harm than good: (For why should I use words against mens edification?) But in other cases I now think it better to keep the word,
 1. lest we seem to the ignorant to be of another Religion than all the ancient Churches were.
 2. Lest we harden Papists, Greeks and others, by denying sound Doctrine in *terms*, which they will think we deny in *sence*. 3. Because our Penury of Words is such as for my part I remember no other word so fit to substitute instead of [*Merit*] or [*Desert*] or [*Worthiness*.] The word [*Rewardable*]

wardable] is long and oft harsh : And what other have we ? And it is nothing else that we mean.

§. 56. Some Papists are against the very word [*Merit*] also. Some own the word, but differ not from the Protestants about the Doctrine, some of them ignorantly drive the poor People by ill preaching into carnal Conceits of their own Works, and to trust an hundred Fopperies for Salvation : But he that readeth most of their School-Doctors, must either confess, that they differ from us about the *meritoriousness* of true Gospel-obedience, rather in *words* than in *deed* ; and that we really mean the same thing, or else he must see with *better* or *worse* Eyes than I do (I speak not this of them all.)

§. 57. And *Romans*, who prateth of Merit in point of *commutative Justice*, disclaimed by the rest (and some such other ignorant Scriblers) are not to be taken for the *Index* of their Doctrine, nor yet their superstitious, abusive Application ; no more than our *Deniers* of *all Merit* are the *Index* of *ours* ; nor the prophane ones abuse of it, who are ready, when we perswade them to a holy Life, to tell us, That God saveth not Men for their Holiness or *Works*, and that *ours* deserve no more than theirs, but he will have mercy on whom he will have mercy ; and it is not of him that *willeth* or *runneth*.

§. 58. Not only *Waldensis*, *Contarenius*, *Ariminensis*, and many others expressly say as much against Merits as we : But *Medina*, and many of the *Thomists* say the same in Sence, and the *Scotists* and many others say, That *Merit* ariseth but *ex pacto*, from God's *Promise* ; and to be *meritorious*, is no more than

than to be a *Work* which God hath promised a *Reward* to: And do any of us deny this?

§. 59. Object. But others say, That *Merit* is *ex dignitate operum*, from the worthiness of our Works.

Ans. Is it the Name [*Worthiness*] or the meaning that displeaseth you? If the Name, read Luke 20. 35. and 21. 36. Acts 5. 41. 2 Theff. 1. 5, 11. Rev. 3. 4. Matth. 8. 10, 11, 13, 37, 38. and 22. 8. 1 Cor. 11. 27, 29. Eph. 4. 1. Col. 1. 10. 1 Theff. 2. 12. and see whether God use not the same Phrase. And as to the Sence, one Writer understands what he saith better, and another worse, and several men may have several Sences; but they mostly seem to mean, That holy Obedience is in the very nature of it so pleasing to the most holy God, as rendereth it apt to be the matter of that Condition on which his Covenant promiseth to reward us, the Imperfection being pardoned, and we and our Works accepted, upon the Redemption wrought by the Merits of Christ, and upon his Intercession, and presenting them to God. And is this to be denied by any Christian? Doubtless there is something in the very Nature of *Divine Faith*, *Love*, and *Obedience*, which maketh it fitter to be accepted and rewarded, than Infidelity, Hatred of God, and Sin, or Rebellion. Speak Christians, is it not so? And yet it is from God's Promise and meer Bounty only, that our Right to the Reward resulteth, though the material Aptitude be in the qualification to which that promise is made: All this is plain and sure.

§. 60. Obj. But some talk of a Proportion between the Work and the Reward.

Ans. We commonly hold degrees of Glory according to the degrees of Holiness; and if any abusive Doctor mean any more, that's nothing to the

the rest. And it's pity that Men that are agreed, should hate or revile each other as differing.

§. 61. *Vasquez* the Jesuit is one that is supposed to say most for Merit, who saith so much against it, as I dare not say: For he tells us, That God doth not reward us at all as an Act of Justice, either *Commutative*, or *Distributive*: *Commutative Justice* he easily disapproveth, and in that we all agree: But the generality of Christians, Papists, Protestants, Greeks, &c. hold, That God rewardeth us in governing-paternal-distributive Justice, as a Father giveth Benefits to a thankful Child that humbly taketh them, and not to the contemptuous or rebellious that spit in his Face. But *Vasquez* saith, That God hath not so much as *Distributive Justice* in our Rewards. And yet, I think, he differeth but in words, and really meaneth as we all do. And he that dare for Words, revile Consenters, is bolder than I would have any good Man be: And yet I doubt not but *I and this Writing* shall be so reviled by many that differ not from me, when they think they do, (through Faction and Prejudice) when I am dead, even for these words.

§. 62. IV. The fourth Point is so far dispatched in the second, that I need here but to say; 1. That our Obedience to God is a Duty resulting from our very natural Being, and cannot but be so while we are Men: 1. As it is God's due. 2. As it is part of the right Order of the Universe, and conduible to common Good. 3. As it is our own Order, Rectitude and Health.

2. That Christ is the Saviour and Physician to give us this Health, which is the end of his medicinal Grace.

3. That

3. That the Soul cannot be complacentially amiable to God, nor fit for Communion with him here or in Heaven without it. Resignation to God our Owner, Obedience to God our Ruler, and Love and Praise to God our Father, and the infinite Good, make up that Holiness which is our Salvation it self, and the Image and Glory of God upon us.

§. 63. V. About the next Question I may yet be shorter, *How far any Works of ours may be trusted in?*

I think all agree, 1. That nothing of ours (or any Creature) should be trusted to for any thing proper to God, or proper to Christ, or any thing that belongeth not truly to it self. He that ascribeth any thing to our Faith, Love, or Obedience, which is proper to Christ's Merits, or God's Mercy, and so trusteth them, doth greatly sin, and he that trusteth them for more than God hath assigned to them to do.

§. 64. 2. That we must take heed of scandalous Language, and therefore must not talk of trusting on any act of our own, when it is like to be understood, as put in Competition with God or with Christ's Merits; as if the Question were, Whether we must trust God, or our selves, Christ's Righteousness or our own? For our own is not in the least measure to be trusted for that which belongeth only to Christ's Righteousness to be, or do.

§. 65. 3. That yet it is a great Duty to trust every means of Salvation appointed by God, in its own place, and for its own part alone, even to preaching, Sacraments, Afflictions, &c. And accordingly to trust our own Faith, Love, Prayer, Obedience, so far as they are Means, and have God's Promise, and

and no further ; which is no more than to *trust in God*, that he will bless such means. He that trusteth his Sword, doth not trust it to fight of it self, without his Hand. When God hath promised Mercy upon *Prayer*, and to the *Obedient* or *Penitent*, for a man to think that God will yet do no more for us, if we *repent*, *pray*, and *obey*, than if we do not, is to be *Unbelievers*, and say rebelliously, *It is in vain to serve the Lord*. He is so far to trust to *Faith*, *Repentance*, *praying*, *hearing*, *meditating*, *diligence*, as to trust that God will bless them, and reward them, and look for more from him when we use means, than when we do not.

CHAP. XXVI.

Of Confirmation, Perseverance, and Danger of falling away.

§. 1. **I** Shall reduce all that needs to be said on this point to these following controverted Questions : ' 1. *Whether all Grace* procured and ' *given by Christ, be such as is never lost ?* 2. *Whether that degree of Grace be ever lost, which* ' *giveth the posse credere without the act of Faith* ' *(commonly called sufficient Grace) in Adult or* ' *Infants ?* 3. *Whether any lose actual true justifying Faith ?* 4. *Whether any lose true Holiness,* ' *or love of God in the Habit ?* 5. *Whether any* ' *degree of this be ever lost ? or all special Grace* ' *have such Confirmation as the Angels have ?* ' 6. *Whether, if Holiness be never lost, it be pos-* ' *sible to lose it, and be in danger ?* 7. *Whether* ' *there*

'there be a state of confirmed Persons besides the
 'meerly sanctified, that from the degree or kind
 'of their grace, never fall away? 8. Or whether
 'Perseverance depend on meer Election and God's
 'Will, which secureth only some of the justified?
 '9. Whether all, or most, or many Christians are
 'themselves sure to persevere? 10. Whether Certain-
 'ty of perseverance be fit for all the justified?
 '11. Whether it be unfit for all, and a more unsafe
 'Condition than doubting? 12. Whether the
 'Comfort of most Christians lie upon the Doctrine
 'of such Certainty? 13. Whether the Doctrine
 'of Eventual Apostacy infer any mutability in God?
 '14. Why God hath left this point so dark? 15.
 'What was the Judgment of the ancient Churches
 'after the Apostles? 16. Whether it be an
 'Article of such evidence and weight, as to be put
 'into our Church-Confessions, and we should force
 'men to subscribe to it, or make it necessary to Mi-
 'nistration, Communion, or Christian Love and
 'Concord?

§. 2. Q. I. *Whether all Christ's Grace given us, be
 such as is never lost?* Ans. No: except Jansenius
 and his Followers, I know of no Christians that e-
 ver affirm it; and he doth it on this false suppo-
 sition, That the *common Grace* which worke:h only
 preparaterily by fear, is not the *Grace of Christ*, but a
 grace of *other Providence*, and only *Love* is the *grace of
 Christ*. But it is injurious to Christ, who is the Lord,
 and Light, and Saviour of the World, and God's Ad-
 ministrator-general, into whose Hands all Things
 and Power is given, to say, That since the Fall
 there is any *Grace in the World* that is not *his Grace*;
 and that our preparatory grace, and all that's com-
 mon,

mon, is aliunde, some other way. He that readeth *Joh. 15. Matth. 13. Heb. 6, and 10.* may see the contrary.

§. 3. Q II. *Whether sufficient grace to believe, which giveth the meer power of believing to Infants or Adult, be ever lost?* Ans. These Questions suppose that there are these several sorts of Graces disputed of by Divines: 1. *Common grace*: 2. *Power to believe and repent*: 3. *Actual Faith and Repentance* given by that called *special Vocation*: 4. *The Habit of love and all grace, called Sanctification*: (to pass by *Relative grace*, as *Justification, &c.*) 5. *Confirmation* of these Habits. And we now speak only of the second: And the very *Being* of that Grace is controverted, Whether God ever give (besides the *natural Power*) a *moral Power to believe, to any that never do believe?* And, 1. it is certain by *Adam's* instance, that he gave him a power to have perfectly obeyed, when he did not: 2. And therefore no man can prove, that now he giveth no man a *moral Power to believe, that doth not.* 3. But it seemeth most probable that he doth, because his *Government* and *Man's Nature* are not, *tota specie*, changed. 4. And it is certain that still all men have power to do more good than they do. 5. And even the *Dominicans* grant this *Sufficiency* of grace. 6. But yet for my part, I am not certain of it.

§. 4. But if there be such a power given, which never acteth Faith (which I think most probable) it is either in the *Adult* or *Infants*: if in the *Adult*, no doubt it's lost; for they that will not believe (to the last) retain not still the *moral power* in their Rebellion.

§. 5.

§. 5. But in the *Case of Infants*, I think those of them that *die before the use of reason*, lose it not, nor any of the *Elect* that live to full Age: But as to *others*, after long doubt, *How far Infant-Grace is loseable*, *How far Infants Grace is loseable.* this seemeth now the most probable solution to me.

§. 6. *Viz.* There is a Grace that reacheth but to a *moral Power* to repent and believe, before men have the *Act* or proper *Habit*: Such Grace to persevere, did put *Adam* in a *present state of Life*, or acceptation with God, this Grace *Adam* lost: Accordingly such grace that containeth but this *moral power* in an *Infant's* Disposition (with *relative* grace of Pardon) is sufficient to prove his *right to Salvation*, if he so die; because he is not bound to the *Act*, nor capable of it; and even the *Adult* upon the *Act*, have right to *Acceptance* and to the *Spirit* to cause the *Habit*, in order of Nature, before they have the *Habit*: Therefore Infants may be in a state of *such Right and Life* before the *Habit*, though they shall not possess *Glory* without it: And yet the *Adult* are not in a state of *such right* by the *meer Power*, before the *Act*, because the *Act* it self is made necessary to their *Justification*, but so is it not to *Infants*: So that *Infants* and *Adult* may receive a *meer power* to repent and believe, and lose it after (at age) by actual sin, though this be a loss of a *state of Justification* to the one sort (their sins of *Nature* being pardoned), but not to the other (who are not pardoned without the *Act* :) And yet it followeth not hence, that the grace of *habitual Sanctification* is lost in any.

§. 7. If this solution please not, let them that can, give us one that is less inconvenient, and we shall thankfully accept it; but it must be none that yet I have heard of; not the *Anabaptists*; nor those of their Adversaries, who leave us *no certainty of the Salvation of any particular Infants*, but only say, *God will save them that are Elect*, but no one knoweth who they are, nor how few or many, nor can tell us of any promise made to any upon any antecedent Character or Condition, nor give Believers any more assurance of their own Childrens Salvation, than of any Heathens.

Nor theirs that say, *Baptized Infants are saved by relative Grace alone*, without any internal real Grace.

Nor theirs that say, *They have the Spirit*, but tell us not in what operation; or say, it is only right to the Spirit hereafter.

Nor theirs that say, That all Baptized Infants (at least of godly Parents) have *habitual Holiness* (Faith, Love, &c.) such as the Adult in Sanctification have, and that some at Age do lose it: I think this less inconvenient than any one of these.

§. 8. Q. III. *Whether any lose true actual Faith and Justification?*

Ans. That a common *uneffectual Faith* may be lost, is no doubt: But concerning the other, there are three Opinions. 1. Some say, No; it cannot be lost, because that Faith hath the Promise of the Sanctification of the Spirit, as well as of Pardon and right to Life. Therefore seeing habitual Holiness is not lost, that which hath the Promise of it, is not lost.

2. Others

2. Others say, That *actual Faith* at first is like *Adam's loseable Grace*; and that it giveth us actual Pardon and right to Life, if we *so die*, and right to the *Spirit* (in relation) to sanctifie us in time, and by degrees: But that every one that hath the Spirit, hath not the *Habits* of Love and Holiness, but he sometimes is causing many Acts before he produce a Habit (*ad modum acquisitorum.*)

3. Others say, That both *Faith* and *habituall Holiness* are oft lost. I delay the solution till the rest be considered.

§. 9. Q. IV. *Whether habituall Love, or Holiness (or the Spirit) be ever lost?*

Ans. That there is a confirmed state or degree of *Holiness* that is never lost, I do hold; and that this is attainable, and in that state men may be certain of *Salvation*: But whether the least degrees of *habituall grace* be utterly loseable, which prove a present right to life, till they are lost, I must plainly profess I do not know; much may be said on both sides: And if my Ignorance offend any, it offendeth me more: but how shall I help it, I think it is not for want of *Study*, nor of impartial willingness to know the Truth: And Ignorance of the two is safer than *Error*, by which we trouble and seduce those about us. And in this case so many great and excellent Men have erred (either *Augustine*, with the generality of the ancient Churches, or *Calvin*, *Zanchy*, and most of the Reformed) that my Ignorance is pardonable where their *Error* it self is pardoned. But let those that are wiser rejoyce in the greater measure of their Wisdom: But yet think not, that taking up either Opinion upon the trust of their Party, is such.

§. 10. Q. V. To the next, some have said; That had *Adam* done but one act of Love or Obedience, he had been *confirmed* as the Angels in a state of Impeccability: And that so are all that once truly believe in Christ. But Experience utterly confuteth that. For all men sin after believing.

§. 11. Others say only, That men may sin, and may lose *acquired Grace*, but no degree of that which is *infused*: But we have small reason to think that our *encreased degrees* are not *as much infused* as the *first degree* was: And yet Experience proveth, that such added degrees may be lost.

§. 12. Others say, *All added degrees* may be lost, but none of that which was *first infused*: Indeed could we prove, that God alwaies at first infuseth only the least degree consistent with Salvation, then this must be held by all that deny that any fall from Justification: But for ought we know God may the first minute give one man more Grace than to another in long time, and that *first degree* may be lessened by his sin.

§. 13. Q. VI. *Whether it be possible to lose that Holiness which never will be lost?*

Ans. The word [*Possible*] respecteth either a Consequence in Arguing, and is a *Logical Possibility*; or it respecteth the *natural power of Causes*, and is called, *Physical Possibility*. In the first sence it is *impossible* that any thing should come to pass that doth not; because God knoweth it will not: And it is a good consequence, God knoweth that this will not come to pass; therefore it will not: And it is *impossible* that this Consequence should be false.

But as to the *natural Possibility*, no doubt but of

of our selves we can sin; nay, it is not an act of Power, but of Impotency, or from a defect of Power: And the *Habit* given us is not a sufficient Power to ascertain our *Perseverance* of it self. But if you speak with respect to the Power of God, by which we are preserved, we must thus answer: That it is impossible for us or any Creature to overcome God's Power or Will: And if it be first proved, that God will cause us to persevere by the way of *Physical irresistible determination by Power*, then it must be called *Impossible* to fall away, or commit any Sin which he so faveth us from. But if he keep any as a free Agent by the *Sapiential disposal* of his *Free-will*, and so procure the event of a contingent action, then it must be said, that this and many things are possible which never come to pass, That God only decreeth, that we shall not fall away, and not, that it shall be impossible: Thus Dr. Twisse and the Dominicans themselves use to speak: But for my part I take God's manner of working on and for us, to be so unsearchable, and this notion of Possibility or Impossibility, of so little moment when we are agreed what will be the event, that I think the Controversie not worth the handling, but made among other snares of Satan, to trouble the Church, and draw us to vain Janglings about words that edifie not, from the Simplicity that is in Christ.

§. 14. Q. VII. *Whether there be a State of Confirmation here?*

Ans. 1. Undoubtedly there are some Christians that are strong, rooted, settled, established; and some that are weak, and like Children to's'd up and down, Rom. 4. 20. & 15. 1. Heb. 5. 12, 14. 1 Joh. 2. 14. 1 Cor. 16. 13. Eph. 6. 10. 2 Tim.

2. 1. 1 Cor. 15. 58. 1 Pet. 5. 9. Col. 2. 5. Eph. 3. 16, 17. Col. 2. 7. There is a need of *strengthening Grace*, 1 Pet. 5. 10. Lnk. 22. 32. Rev. 3. 2. Act. 9. 22. Col. 1. 11. 2 Tim. 4. 17. Psal. 138. 3. Phil. 4. 13.

§. 15. 2. It is agreeable to Scripture, Reason and Experience to judge, that *strengthened Christians* stand faster than the *weak*, and that it is in it self more *unlikely* that they should be seduced and forsake Christ.

§. 16. Seeing it is so doubtful, whether *any* that are sincere fall away; we have great reason to think that it will hardlier be proved of the *Confirmed*: I know that *Strength* hath several degrees, and it's hard to determine just what this *Confirmation* is, but I am perswaded, that *abundance of confirmed Christians* there are, who have taken hold of Christ by Faith and Love, and have clear light and great experience, and so much Grace, as that from that *Confirmation* it may be inferred; that they never fall away and perish: and consequently that *Certainty of Salvation*, and not only of present Justification, is attainable in this Life. And some of the Papists themselves are of this mind, though others of them say, That even a state of *Confirmation* may be lost.

§. 17. Q. VIII. *Whether Perseverance depend on meer Election?*

Ans. It was *Augustine's* Judgment (and his Followers) That *Election* is the ascertaining Cause of Perseverance, giving the special *Grace of Perseverance*; but what that Grace was besides Divine *Volition* and *Preservation* (whether any special *confirming degree or kind*) it is not easie to gather out of him: And I think it past doubt, That God doth

doth elect some to Perseverance, and all persevere whom he so electeth, and because he electeth them and no other : But whether many also are truly sanctified and justified that are not elect, and so do not persevere, as Austin held, I said before, I do not know.

§. 18. Q. IX. Are all or most Christians certain that they shall persevere ?

Ans. No : For, 1. most Christians in the World hold, that Perseverance is uncertain to the godly ; and how can they be certain of it to themselves ?

2. Most that hold otherwise, hold it but as uncertain, and are not themselves certain that it is true, though they call it certain : I am uncertain : And I find not by other signs that the most have more knowledge than my self : And he that is not certain of the Premises, is not by them certain of the Conclusion.

3. Most Christians are uncertain that they are sincere and justified : And such cannot be certain to persevere in that which they are not certain that they have.

§. 19. Q. X. Certainty of their present state of Justification is not fit for those that sin as much, and are as bad as ever will stand with sincerity (till they repent :) Therefore certainty of Perseverance must needs be unfit for them. And therefore God never giveth it to such.

§. 20. Q. XI. Certainty of Grace, Justification and Perseverance and Salvation, is a most excellent desirable thing, above all the Treasures of the World, and to be earnestly sought by all : and leadeth not of it self to carnal security, but to fill the soul with holy Love and Thankfulness and

Joy, and make our Lives likest to Heaven on Earth: O blessed are they that do attain it: And woe to them that dispraise it and perswade men to causeless doubting. It is the height of our attainment here in it self, and the improvement, and maketh us live a Heavenly Life, and long to be with Christ: But we cannot therefore say that those have it that have it not: But all should promote and seek it.

§. 21. Q. XII. They that are certain that all *true Believers persevere*, have one great help towards their own Consolation: But if they be uncertain, that they *themselves are true Believers*, this will not comfort them. As they that are perswaded only that all Confirmed Christians persevere, must know that *they* are confirmed before this can give them the comfort of Assurance.

§. 22. But I have elsewhere fully proved,
 1. That most Christians have not the comfort of their own certain Perseverance, for want of the Certainty of their Sincerity, if not of the Doctrine it self. 2. And that thousands and millions of Christians live and die in Peace and Comfort, that have not a *proper Certainty of Salvation*. 3. Much more may such live in Joy that are sure of their *present state of Grace*, though not of their *Perseverance*.

§. 23. For Experience telleth us, that though most of the Christian World are against the Doctrine of Certain Perseverance of all true Believers, yet many of them live and die in Comfort.

§. 24. And Church-History and the Ancients Writings tell us, That though for many hundred years the Christian Doctors commonly held, That
 some

some lose true justifying Faith, and perish, yet multitudes lived and died in Joy, and went with boldness through the flames.

§. 25. And we see in all things that men are affected according to what is *predominant*; and he that hath far more *Hope* than *fear* and *doubting*, will have more joy than sorrow, though he be not *certain*, but some doubting do remain.

§. 26. It is *certain in it self*, that God's Promises in the Gospel are all true: But every one that truly believeth it, is not properly *certain* of it, past all doubt: And he that hath the least doubt of the truth of the Gospel, must needs doubt as much of that Salvation which is expected on the Gospel-Promise: And yet such Believers may have Peace and Joy according to the measure of their Faith and Hope.

§. 27. We see among men no Wife is certain one day or night that her Husband will not forsake or murder her; no Child is certain that his Father will not kill him; nor any one of his dearest Friend: And yet we can have Love, Peace and Comfort in our Relations, without such *certainty*: For it's melancholy folly to live in fears of things utterly *unlikely*, and to cast away the Comforts of great *probability*.

§. 28. Yea, no godly man is *certain* that he shall not fall into such *hainous Sin* as *Noah*, *Lot*, *David*, *Peter* did; or that he shall not kill his dearest Friend, or himself: And yet when a man is conscious that his Nature, his Reason, his Experience, and his Resolution, do all make him hate such a wicked act, and that there is no probable cause to move him to it, and when we know God is ready with his Grace to help us, how few lose

the Comfort of their Lives, by fear of such improbable things? Certainty therefore is very desirable, but a hope of great probability may give us joyful thankful Hearts, or else few Christians would have such.

§. 29. And the Doctrine of *Perseverance* hath its difficulties too as to mens comfort: For he that holdeth, That no man falleth from a state of Grace, and seeth many, that to all possible humane judgment, were once excellent persons, fall quite away, can himself have no assurance that he is so much as justified at the present, unless he be sure that he is better than the best of all those persons ever were, which doubt the other side are not cast upon.

§. 30. Q. XIII. *Whether the Doctrine of Apostacy infer any mutability in God?*

Ans. No: there's no shew of it, unless you hold, that his absolutely *Elect* fall away. It was no change in God when he gave us grace, and justified us; and it would be no more if he cease, than it was to begin. It was no change in God when I was born; and it will be no more when I die: The Change is only in *Man*, and his *receptive Disposition*. Even the Law of the Land, without any Diversity or Change, doth virtually condemn a thousand Malefactors, and justifie the Just; and will cease to justifie them, and begin to condemn them, if they cease to be just, and begin to be Offenders. The Changes that God himself maketh in all the World, are made without any Change in him: Therefore what man doth, or undoth, cannot change him.

§. 31. Q. XIV. *Why did God leave this Case so dark?*

Ans. It is not fit for us to call for any reason of

of his doing, but what he hath given us : But while he hath made it sure to us, that he will cause all his Elect to persevere, and will deny his Grace to none that faithfully seek it, and will save all that do not wilfully and finally reject it, and giveth us no cause to distrust his Mercy, his holy Ends are by this attained in his Peoples Uprightness and Peace ; And he seemeth by leaving the rest so obscure, to tell us, that it is not a matter of so great use to us, as some imagine, and that it is not a point fit for to be the measure of our Communion or Peace.

§. 32. XV. *What was the judgment of the ancient Churches of this Point ?*

Ans. *Vossius* in his *Pelagian History*, hath truly told you, and copiously proved it in the main. Before *Augustine's* time it was taken commonly as granted, That men might fall away from a state of Grace, and that many did ; but the Case was not notoriously discussed : But some thought that confirmed Christians never fell : But upon *Pelagius* his Disputes, *Augustine* defending the honour of Grace, laid all upon Election, and maintained, That though the Non-elect did fall away from the Love of God and Justification, and a state in which they had been saved, had they died ; yet none of the Elect did fall so as to perish, but that the preservation of Grace in perseverance, was the fruit of Election. Thus *Prosper*, and *Fulgentius* after him ; and some Passages in him and *Macarius*, and some others, intimate that they thought there was a confirmed degree of Grace, which was never lost ; but they all took it for granted, that some fell from a state of Justification and perished : And I remember not one Writer that I have read and noted,
to

to be of the contrary mind for a thousand years after the writing of the Scriptures, nor any mention of any Christian that was so; unless *Hierome* be to be believed of *Jovinian*, who saith, that he held, That the godly could not sin; which Report is much to be suspected on many accounts.

§. 33. What Use is to be made of this, I leave to others; but it becometh no good Man to deprave or deny the Truth of such History: And some great Divines are to be blamed for reproaching *Vossius* for a true Historical Report, when they neither can confute him, nor attempt it. Two or three Sentences out of *Austin* are cited by some, but meerly mistaken, as if they spake that of all the Justified, which he speaketh only of the Elect.

§. 34. Q. XVI. By all that is said, it is past denial, that Certainty of perseverance should be most earnestly sought, and that state of Confirmation which is likeliest to obtain it; but that few have it, even of the truly godly, and that it is not the common ground of Christians Peace and Comfort, but *Hopes* upon great Probability, do sustain the most; and that the difficulty of the point is such, as that it should in all Churches be left free, and neither side made necessary to our Christian Love, Peace, Concord, Communion, or Ministry.

C H A P. XXVII.

Of Repentance; late Repentance; the time of Grace, and of the unpardonable Sin.

§. 1. **R**epentance, as a Pain, and involuntary, is part of the Punishment of sin by the Law of Works; but Repentance as a returning to God, and

and a recovery of the Soul, is a *Grace* and *Duty* proper to the Subjects of the Redeemer under the Law of Grace.

§. 2. Yea, it is a great and excellent part of the Law of Grace to give Repentance unto life, and to admit of Repentance after sin, which the Law of Innocency did not admit of.

§. 3. Therefore *John* and Christ himself did preach the Gospel or Law of Grace, when they preached Repentance; which was a great part, even of Christ's own preaching.

§. 4. Therefore the *Antinomian* Libertines know not what they talk of, when they call it Legal Preaching, and set Repentance as in opposition to Faith, as if Faith were all that the Gospel did command, or Repentance did not belong to Faith.

§. 5. Yet it must be confessed, that of late times many have laid more upon the sorrowing, weeping, and fearing part of Repentance, than was meet, and said too little of the turning of the Soul from worldly and fleshly sinful Pleasures, to the delightful Love and Praises of God, and willing Obedience and Conformity to his Will, which is the principal part of true Repentance. And, I think God permitted the *Antinomians* to rise up, and cry up *Free-Grace*, and call the Ministers *Legallists*, to rebuke our Error in this point, and to call us to preach up his Grace more plentifully, and to consider better that Gospel-obedience doth chiefly consist in *Thankfulness*, *Love* and *Joy*, and in the words of *Praise*, and *Works of Love*. I am sure this use we should make of their Abuses.

§. 6. Repentance is either *general*, or *particular*;
General (or Universal) Repentance is a turning of
the

the Understanding, Will, and Practice (with repenting Sorrow) from the inordinate Estimation, Love, and seeking of temporal Things for the Pleasure and Prosperity of the Flesh (or sensual powers) to God, his Will, and Service, and the Hopes of everlasting glory; through Faith.

§. 7. *This Repentance is the same thing with Conversion, and as I said before, Faith it self includeth Repentance in its Essence, as denominated from the terminus a quo, it being a Turning from Unbelief to God by believing in him as God, and to Christ by believing in him, as our Saviour, and to the Holy Ghost by believing in him, as the Agent and Witness of Christ and our Sanctifier.*

§. 8. *Particular Repentance is our turning with Sorrow from a particular Sin, to our contrary obedience to God.*

§. 9. *Without that universal Repentance or Conversion, which turneth the Mind, Will, and Life to God, from created Vanity and this World, no Man can be saved; because he continueth an Idolater and Rebel, and doth not indeed take God for his God, nor Christ for his Saviour, nor the Holy Spirit for his Sanctifier; but is an ungodly Man, and a Forsaker of God and his own Felicity.*

§. 10. *Repentance, as towards God, is sometime distinguished from Faith in Christ: And then Repentance is our turning to God, as God, by Faith (Trust) Love, and Obedience, resigning our selves to him as our Owner, subjecting our selves to him as our Ruler, and loving him as our Benefactor, and chiefly as the Infinite Good in himself, our ultimate objective End. And this is the greater Duty respecting God, as our End, even the same with Love to God*

God, for the procuring of which *Christ* came into the World, and *Faith* is given us: And then *Faith* in *Christ* is the *mediate* grace and duty by which we are brought to this Repentance.

§. 11. Not that any man can truly take *Christ* for his *Saviour*, before he taketh *God* for his *God*, (for the *Love* and *Intention* of the *End*, is before our *Choice* and *Use* of the *Means*:) But *Christ* being our *Teacher* first bringeth us to assent to the Truth of *God's Perfections* and *Relations* to us, and then to the Truth of his own *Gospel*, and by this *Assent* bringeth us (first to a *common*, and then) to a *special Consent* at once, that *God* be our *God*, and *Christ* our *Saviour*; but so that we desire *God* as our *End*, and *Christ* as *Mediator*, as the *Means*.

§. 12. *Universal Repentance* (or *Conversion*) doth *virtually* contain all *particular future Repentance*, but not *actually*. Therefore where this is, that Soul may be saved without *actual Repentance* for some *particular sins* (or sorts of sin) : As, e. g. if we are ignorant that such or such a thing is sin, for want of necessary *Instruction*, or if in a crowd of business some sinful Thought, Passion, or Word pass unobserved, or if we do our faithful endeavour to find out a sin, and cannot, remember it (as who can remember at *Conversion* one of many that he has committed in *Unregeneracy*, and after many are forgotten :) And every Man dieth in some sin, which he hath no time here to repent of; viz. in some sinful imperfection of all grace and duty, and omission of due degrees of Love, and other Acts: For all which *virtual repentance* will be accepted.

§. 13. But *great* and *heinous sins* must needs have *actual repentance*, because it will not consist with the Truth

Truth of Holiness to be so indifferent or easie towards them, as not to observe them, and remember them: And if they be *known* and *remembered*, they *will be* repented of, when the Soul hath opportunity to consider what it hath done. For *habitual repentance* is necessary to Salvation; and *Habits will act* when they are not extraordinarily hindered, having notable Objects and Opportunity.

§. 14. Yet some sins that are *great materially* in their nature, may be lessened much to some persons by unavoidable ignorance, and so may not have an actual *repentance*: As, *e. g.* in times of *War*, to *kill men in a wrong Cause*, is one of the greatest sins in the World; and yet when by the darkness of *State-cases*, the Question *who is in the right*, is so difficult, that very few can decide it; and after their utmost search, each Party thinks that God bindeth them to fight for their *King* or *Country*, such persons cannot have a *particular repentance*, while they are not able to see that they were deceived.

§. 15. It is therefore a Case of exceeding difficulty, *what sins may stand with Justification*, not particularly repented of, and what not; or as some speak, which are *mortal*, and which *venial* sins, or sins of *Infirmity*.

§. 16. But he that hath a care of his Salvation, must hate all sin in the general as sin, and keep up his watch and be willing to know all the worst in himself, and diligently use the means to know it, and resolve to forsake it to his power, when he knoweth it, that so he may not be *wilfully impenitent*. And he that will sin as far as he thinks will stand

stand with grace, either hath no true grace, or shall not know that he hath it.

§. 17. The *time of repentance* or mercy, may be said in two Sences to be past ; 1. When a man shall not be accepted and pardoned, though he should repent : And so the Day of grace is never past in this Life (and the Damned do not truly repent in our present Sence ;) so that for a penitent person to fear that the Day of grace is past, or his Repentance too late (if true) is to contradict the Scope of the Gospel, which giveth pardon to every one that truly repenteth. 2. When a man that *before* had some *motions* and *helps* to repent, and obstinately resisted them, shall be given up to his Obstinacy, and never have such *motions* more. Thus the Day of grace may be past with many : And such persons turn from God to Wickedness, and are hardened in the love of sin, and usually blinded to defend it, and hate a holy Life : But those that do repent, or fain would repent, or yet feel God moving them to repent, have no cause to think that God hath thus forsaken them. For it is only obstinate and continued forsaking God, that is the sign of one forsaken by him.

§. 18. And this also is no proof to us, that such a Person is *finally forsaken*. For many that have rejected grace many years, are afterward converted by that grace : So that all that we can say, is, That such as God hath forsaken, do continue to the end to reject his Mercy, and prefer their Lusts ; but that he will so continue to the end, no man himself can tell before the end.

§. 19. About the *unpardonable sin* there are two Controversies : 1. *What it is*. 2. *Whether it be absolutely unpardonable*.

That

That *final impenitency* is unpardonable, is undoubted; But the sin in question

See Mr. Hales of the sin against the H. Ghost; and Paraphrase on Matth. 12. lately published.

called, *The Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost*; of which having written a special Tractate, I now only say, That it is the Sin of such as believing not Christ to be the Son of God, but a Deceiver, and yet being con-

vinced of his, and his Disciples Miracles, do in their judgments think, and blasphemously say and maintain, that they were done by the power of the Devil to deceive men. These men rejecting the last convincing means of Faith, are left by themselves remediless.

§. 20. But, 2. the Papists and many Ancients say, That by [*not forgiven*] is meant only [*very hardly and rarely*]; but most Protestants expound the words absolutely, as they run; which the Reader will think most probable, I leave to his consideration.

§. 21. Some think that the *Novatians* denied all pardon to such as committed any great sin after Baptism; but *Albaspineus*, *Petavius*, and others have truly proved that it was not so, but only that they denied *Power* in the Church to pardon such Backsliders; which yet, no doubt, was their Error, seeing as God on his part pardoneth men as oft as they truly repent; so the Church must pardon as far as belongs to them, such as seem truly to repent: But frequent gross sinning doth so much disprove mens verbal repenting, that such mens credit being forfeit, their words are not to be taken till they amend their lives.

T H E E N D.

y
u
f
r
g
i
ts
ry
d
n
i
d
er
rs
at
ch
r,
as
as
e.
f.
e.
en